



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, as we seek Thy blessing, remind us that we cannot deceive Thee, though we may deceive ourselves. We dare not devise our own plans and draft our own schemes and then have the nerve to ask Thee to bless them, for we know that there are some things Thou wilt not and cannot bless. And unless Thy blessing accompanies what we do here, we waste our time. So guide us in what we propose, so that Thou canst bless us in what we produce. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Friday, March 28, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 28, 1947, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) amending the Settlement of Mexican Claims Act of 1942 to provide for the consideration of any claim decided by the General Claims Commission in which the United States filed a petition for rehearing.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of Friday last, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has the floor on the question of the confirmation of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for the transaction of routine business.

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following routine business was transacted:

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of March 28, 1947,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, on March 29, 1947, signed the enrolled bill

(S. 918) to establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the selective-service records, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PRICE OF COPIES OF RECORDS FURNISHED BY DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497; 5 U. S. C., sec. 488) fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

CREDIT OPERATIONS ON LOANS MADE TO INDIAN CHARTERED CORPORATIONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing credit operations through June 30, 1946, on loans made to Indian chartered corporations for the purpose of promoting the economic development of such tribes and of their members (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

IMPROVEMENT OF POULTRY, POULTRY PRODUCTS, AND HATCHERIES

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U. S. C., Supp. V, 429) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with State authorities in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

NOVEMBER 1946 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation for the month of November 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Whereas legislation known as the Hill-Taylor bill has been introduced in the Congress of the United States proposing the establishment of additional national cemeteries in each of the several States; and

"Whereas previous study of such a proposal made by the Quartermaster General, Army Service Forces, has resulted in the recommendation that a national cemetery

be established in the capital district of the State of New York; and

"Whereas the territory embraced in such capital district contains a population of nearly a million two hundred thousand inhabitants; and

"Whereas the city of Troy, N. Y., with its rich historical background, its ideal location in the beautiful foothills of the Adirondacks, its easy accessibility by rail, water, and air makes it an ideal site; and

"Whereas such city of Troy, N. Y., was the home of two Congressional Medal of Honor awardees, Lt. Col. William J. O'Brien and Sgt. Thomas A. Baker, both of whom paid the supreme sacrifice on Saipan Island; and

"Whereas the origin of the cognomen 'Uncle Sam' by which the United States of America is affectionately known throughout the world, is attributed to the city of Troy, N. Y.; and

"Whereas the several national veterans' organizations, including among others, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled Veterans of America, the Cootlette Club, the Jewish War Veterans, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart, through their New York State departments, have endorsed the city of Troy, N. Y., as a site for a national cemetery: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the legislation heretofore designated as the Hill-Taylor bill or the embodying provisions thereof and to adopt the same without delay and give to the city of Troy, N. Y., favorable consideration as a proposed site for a national cemetery; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from the State of New York."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas there is urgent need for the establishment of a Federal institution for the training of diplomats, economic advisers, and military attachés in the Foreign Service of the United States, to the end that the representatives abroad of the United States may be prepared to meet the responsibilities of their offices; and

"Whereas the Honorable LOWELL STOCKMAN has introduced into the House of Representatives H. R. 1770, which provides for the establishment and maintenance of an academy for the instruction and training of students in the theory and practices of international and diplomatic relations, to be known as the United States Foreign Service Academy; and

"Whereas the enactment of H. R. 1770 will meet this Nation's growing and obvious need for the training of personnel in its Foreign Service; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact H. R. 1770, to the end that an academy may be established for the training of personnel in the Foreign Service of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and he hereby is directed to send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"House Resolution 36

"Resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation authorizing the completion of the San Diego aqueduct with Government funds

"Whereas the city of San Diego, which normally has a 10-year water supply on hand, now has only a 9 months' supply of such water, due to the tremendous diversion of water from its water supply in past months to the military and naval bases in the area; and

"Whereas in 1944 the United States Navy undertook to increase the water supply of the city of San Diego by the construction of an aqueduct running from the San Jacinto Reservoir to the San Vicente Reservoir but was forced to cancel the construction contracts at the end of the war due to slashes in the budget of the Navy Department: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized and requested to pass legislation authorizing the completion of the San Diego aqueduct project with Government funds; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to grant to the State of California acreage in the Presidio of San Francisco for establishing the new San Francisco State College

"Whereas it is of the utmost importance that a new San Francisco State College be established in the San Francisco metropolitan area, for the primary purpose of training teachers and offering educational opportunities to veterans; and

"Whereas the housing shortage has made it impossible to acquire buildings within which to house such an educational institution, nor is there available any publicly or privately owned land upon which necessary buildings could be erected; and

"Whereas the present need to establish a new San Francisco State College is based upon facts which affect the welfare of the entire State. More school facilities are needed in order to grant to veterans the education to which they are entitled. More school facilities are needed to train additional teachers,

so as to meet the critical need for more trained teachers in California.

"San Francisco is the center, geographically, and from the point of ease of transportation to and from the city, for a large, closely populated section of the State of California; and

"Whereas the State of California is ready to establish a new San Francisco State College to meet these needs, if land is made available for that purpose; and

"Whereas there is acreage in the Presidio of San Francisco, which would appear not to be essential to the Federal uses of the Presidio, and which would be most appropriate as the site for the new San Francisco State College: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That Congress is hereby respectfully memorialized to take whatever action is necessary to grant to the State of California sufficient acreage in the Presidio of San Francisco for the establishment of the new San Francisco State College; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President, the Secretary of War, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. GEORGE:

Two resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Be it resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That—

"Whereas the Seventy-ninth Congress of the United States enacted a measure sponsored by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, and Congressman GRAHAM A. BARDEN, of North Carolina, to authorize increased appropriations to States for the further development of vocational education; and

"Whereas there is great need for expanding this phase of education throughout Georgia; and

"Whereas there is tremendous demand on the part of the people of this State for expanding this phase of our educational program; and

"Whereas the State and local school systems have made provisions for matching in full funds that will be available to Georgia should Congress appropriate the full amount authorized by the George-Barden Act; and

"Whereas any funds made available to the State under the George-Barden Act will be distributed through established State and local educational channels without Federal domination and control: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of Georgia commend the Georgia delegation in National Congress for the active support they gave in securing passage of the George-Barden Act and request that they continue their efforts to get Congress to appropriate the full amount authorized by the George-Barden Act; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Georgia delegation in National Congress.

"Read and unanimously adopted March 17, 1947."

"Whereas the Congress did return the public employment service to the respective States as of November 16, 1946, and provided for payment of all operation expenses by the Federal Government only through June 30, 1948; and

"Whereas the Congress has appropriated funds to meet the full cost of operating the public employment services since January of 1942; and

"Whereas the Federal unemployment compensation tax collected on pay rolls of employers has greatly exceeded the entire cost

of the operation of the public employment service and unemployment compensation programs; and

"Whereas the States were required under the Wagner-Peyser Act to appropriate a portion of the expense for the operation of the public employment service from its general fund up to and prior to 1942: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Georgia State Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress be, and it hereby is memorialized to provide for the necessary funds to meet all operating expenses of the public employment services subsequent to June 30, 1948; be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to the Clerk of the House of Representatives and to the Secretary of the Senate of the Eightieth Congress, and to each United States Senator and Representative from Georgia.

"Read and unanimously adopted March 19, 1947."

By Mr. AIKEN:

Petitions of sundry citizens of Derby Line, Newport, Island Pond, Morgan, West Charleston, Springfield, and Morrisville, all in the State of Vermont, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received an excellent letter from Dr. Ormal L. Miller, pastor of the First Methodist Church, Topeka, Kans., taking a stand against universal military training. I ask unanimous consent to present this letter for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,

Topeka, Kans., March 6, 1947.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I am becoming increasingly concerned with the intensive drive which is being made for the establishment of universal military training. As you know, I am very definitely opposed to militarization of our country and it seems to me that this proposal is one of the most vicious that we have confronted. It would be a very serious change of national policy if we should require all our young men to go through a period of compulsory training. I do not believe that with modern methods of warfare such training would have any military value. I certainly think it would be very detrimental from a moral standpoint and an unwarranted interruption of the plans of young men who had their future rather definitely outlined. Surely from an international standpoint it would be a very serious gesture of unfriendliness toward the other nations of the world. I believe we can maintain adequate defenses and protect our interests without engaging on this program of wholesale militarization of all our youth. I hope we may count on you to do everything in your power to oppose this trend and to see that what military force we have is on a strictly volunteer basis.

Best wishes to you in the very difficult task which you confront these days. We appreciate the good leadership which you have been giving us.

Cordially yours,

ORMAL L. MILLER.

**GOVERNMENT SPENDING—LETTER FROM
M. E. FORD**

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD a letter from Hon. M. E. Ford, of Maryville, Mo.

Judge Ford was a prominent member of the convention which framed the Missouri Constitution, and has long been highly respected as a jurist, lawyer, and public-spirited citizen.

I am asking to have this letter printed in the RECORD, not only for its own value, but because it is typical of a large number that I have received and am receiving from people in every walk of life in my State.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARYVILLE, MO., March 28, 1947.

Senator JAMES P. KEM,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The stand you have taken on Government spending is meeting with general approval. You are on the right track and in my opinion the people are going to be with you. But they will not be satisfied with halfway measures. All Government subsidies, bonuses, and grants-in-aid must be discontinued. And I mean all and not all except some pet project that affects a certain class or group.

The most insidious of these schemes is the 50-50 proposition that is made to States and other public corporations. Not all of the people are fools and most of them know that both 50's come out of the same pockets. Grants of various kinds to agriculture, business and other classes of enterprise are now mounting to astronomical proportions, and education, health services, and so-called welfare groups are now demanding reservations on the gravy train. And each and every one of the groups and many others will continue to insist on sticking its respective snout into the public feed trough as long as any particular class is enjoying that privilege. But the squealing will soon cease if each knows that all of the others have been fenced out.

It is my firm conviction that Congress has no right to collect money from the people in the form of taxes and then loan that money to individuals and corporations. Yet, right here in this little city there are so many Government agencies that I have not been able to keep track of them all. And each is dish-ing out money that has been collected from the people. And they are doing it under what is, in my judgment, usurped and unconstitutional authority. I am aware of the fact that the Supreme Court has, by its construction of the commerce and general welfare clauses, transformed what was, originally, a government of limited and delegated powers, into a government of unlimited authority. But it is the duty of Congress, as well as that of the Supreme Court, to not only protect, but to observe the limitations of the Constitution.

Being an old-fashioned Jeffersonian Democrat, I want to get back to the Constitution. And I am ready to support any man who is traveling in that direction, regardless of the party banner under which he is marching. Today, this is a government of the people, by pressure groups, for pressure groups. Congress is responsible, for Congress has yielded to the pressure. And it is now the responsibility of Congress to lead the people back to "Government of the people, by the people, for the people." This is the responsibility of the Congress. It is the responsibility of Congress because the only power that can do it is the hand that holds the purse strings. And the Constitution, wisely, or unwisely, put the purse strings in the hands of Congress. I have always been of the opinion that it was a wise provision and hope that it will prove so.

There is another subject on which I desire to express my sentiments. It has always

been my belief that one of the primary duties of every individual was to pay his debts. If that is right, then it is the primary duty of all of the citizens, in their collective capacity, to pay their collective debts. And it is the duty of this generation to pay its own debts and not pass it on to the next or future generations, for future generations will have their own burdens to bear and they may be much greater than ours. If we are to pay our debts the time to begin is now. It is a herculean task, but the people will undertake it if they know the money they pay out is to be used for that purpose. But they are not going to pay out money to support a vast bureaucracy that is pretending to do something for the people that they can do much better for themselves. Congress must stand on its feet and lead and not lie on its belly with its ear to the ground, trying to find out how to successfully follow.

Very truly yours,

M. E. FORD.

FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from W. J. Krenciewicz, of Shenandoah, Pa., together with resolutions adopted by the Federated Lithuanian Societies and Clubs of the Borough of Shenandoah, Schuylkill County, Pa., relating to the freedom and independence of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were received, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHENANDOAH, PA., March 4, 1947.

The Honorable EDWARD S. MARTIN,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

SIR: Enclosed herewith is a set of resolutions, self-explanatory, passed by the (Federated Lithuanian Societies and Clubs of the Borough of Shenandoah, Schuylkill County, Pa.), on whose behalf I am herewith presenting the same to you in accordance with my directions.

If at all possible, your cooperation in having the resolutions read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be most gratefully appreciated by all of the Lithuanian societies and clubs, not only locally but throughout Pennsylvania and elsewhere.

Respectfully yours,

W. J. KRENCIEWICZ,
Attorney-at-Law.

"Whereas the independence of Lithuania was proclaimed on the 16th day of February 1918, and thereafter, following admission to the League of Nations in 1921, its independence was recognized by the great powers of the world; and

"Whereas the Republic of Lithuania having thus emerged once more as a free and independent country after having been oppressed since the late eighteenth century by the Russian monarchy; and

"Whereas the Soviet states of Russia proclaimed to the world in 1920 its belief in freedom and independence and the right of a free people to govern themselves by, inter alia, entering into a treaty with Lithuania wherein we read these binding words, "Relying on the strength of a declaration made by the Federal Soviet Socialist Republic of Russia to the effect that all peoples of every nationality have the right of self-determination and complete separation from the state to which they belonged previously, Russia, without any reservation whatsoever, recognizes Lithuania as a self-governing and independent state with all juridical consequences that follow from such a recognition and in a spirit of free and good will, re-

nounces all sovereignty rights of Russia concerning the Lithuanian Nation and Lithuanian territory which previously belonged to her. The fact that Lithuania for some time was under Russian sovereignty does not impose on the Lithuanian people and their territory any obligations toward Russia; and

"Whereas having thus had a new birth of freedom, establishing a republican form of government with universal and equal suffrage, Lithuania, as a nation, dedicated itself to the task of peace, industry, commerce, and learning, and thereafter the nation and its people lived in peaceful, free, and harmonious relations in the community of nations of the world; and

"Whereas the Government of Lithuania, eager to preserve its freedom and happiness and with prophetic guidance as to the source of danger to its newly acquired independence and freedom, entered into a Lithuanian-Soviet nonaggression pact on September 28, 1926, which by mutual consent was to be effective until December 31, 1945, read in part: 'Article 2. The Republic of Lithuania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other'; and

"Whereas the Government and people of Lithuania have no national, religious, economic, political, or cultural interests similar or akin to the Russian Government or its people, but differ therefrom in every conceivable aspect, yet, nevertheless, the Republic of Lithuania was annexed by Russia in violation of the existing treaties, and in violation of international law, by the overpowering force and subterfuge of the Russian Government, whereby through the vehicle of a sham election, controlled and dominated by the communistic government, the Republic of Lithuania was incorporated into the United Soviet States of Russia against the will of all of the Lithuanian inhabitants; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States being interested, in accordance with its avowed declaration in the Atlantic Charter, to permit other peoples of the world desiring freedom to remain free and independent; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States declared war against Germany and Japan to thwart and prevent aggression and tyranny to spread its evil forces; and

"Whereas the Republic of Lithuania, following World War I, emerged as a free and independent nation and since demonstrated its ability of capable self-government, and now, following World War II, finds itself deprived of its freedom by a communistic Russia, and its people living under a government alien and differing in every respect from the desires of its people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, loyal citizens of the United States of Lithuanian birth or descent, meeting at the Shenandoah High School this 2d day of March A. D. 1947, do hereby express our united voices in urging the President and the State Department of the United States and the agencies of the United States Government to exert fully the courageous efforts of this Government in doing its utmost to restore the freedom and independence of Lithuania; and be it further

"Resolved, That we beseech the President of the United States and the State Department to request forthwith the withdrawal of the Russian occupational forces from Lithuanian territory, and to further request of the United Soviet States of Russia that the Lithuanian people who have been deported from their country to slave-labor camps in Siberia and elsewhere be returned to their homes and families in Lithuania; and be it further

"Resolved, That we petition the President, the State Department of the United States, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to refrain from signing or ratifying any treaty involving the Baltic region of Europe

which fails to embody the free and independent states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and to present the pleas and supplications for justice and humaneness contained herein to the proper authorities of the United Nations for appropriate action as may be necessary to effect such results of independence and justice; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President, the State Department, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to the Senators of the United States from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to our Representatives in Congress from this district, with a hope and trust that each one, in such manner as he or it may choose, lend every effort toward fostering, aiding, and achieving the independence of a people who wish to be free to govern themselves and loosening them from the shackles of communism."

The foregoing resolutions were passed by the Federated Lithuanian Societies and Clubs of the Borough of Shenandoah, Pa., at a meeting held this 2d day of March A. D. 1947, at the Shenandoah High School, located in Schuylkill County, Pa., by acclamation and unanimous vote.

Witness my hand this 2d day of March A. D. 1947.

ANTHONY STANISKIS,
Chairman.

Attest:

LEONARD J. CHAIKOWSKY,
Secretary.

ADMINISTRATION AND CONTROL OF GERMANY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution relating to the government and control of Germany, adopted by the National Conference on the German Problem, held at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, March 6, 1947.

There being no objection, the resolution was received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The National Conference on Germany, declaring that the purposes and conduct of Germany have been contrary to all basic rules of religion, decency, and international order, as recognized by the general conscience of mankind and as embodied in the basic laws of humanity; regards the events now taking place in Germany and any plans to resurrect the economic and political power of Germany as dangerous to the security of the world; believes a Germany capable of dominating Europe economically will again dominate it politically; and, therefore, resolves that Germany must not again be permitted to become powerful enough to wage war, nor to be used as a pawn in the game of power politics; and with due allowance to the fact that the inhabitants and economy of Germany cannot be ignored in planning the future of Europe, recommends to the Government of the United States and to the United States delegation at the Moscow Conference, the following concrete measures:

1. A civilian Control Commission to be established to control Germany, politically and economically.
2. The Commission is to allow Germany only such political autonomy as is consistent with general security and the development of a democratic government.
3. The French claim to the Saar Basin be recognized. The present Polish-German boundaries should be made permanent. All navigable waterways within Germany should be free to international navigation.
4. The ownership and management of the German steel, coal, and chemical industries of the Ruhr and Rhineland—Germany's war arsenal—should be immediately vested in a consortium of foreign government, including

the Big Four Powers and such additional nations as they may determine.

5. The German general staff should be effectively and permanently dissolved.

6. The promised trial and punishment of the great mass of German war criminals—political, industrial, and military—who have hitherto gone untried and unpunished, should be immediately carried out by an international tribunal.

7. The task of the complete de-nazification which has seriously lagged, must be promptly carried through to completion by the removal of all Nazis and militarists from any position of influence or authority in the political, economic, or educational life of Germany.

8. Allied efforts to bring about the re-education of German youth should concentrate on eliminating the ideologies of nazism, pan-Germanism, master-race obsession and lust for power and conquest, which made war a religion.

9. Heavy industries should be limited to peacetime needs, in accordance with the Potsdam agreement, and as recommended in detail in the final report of the enemy branch of the American Foreign Economic Administration.

10. All cartels, trusts, and cartel-like devices should be permanently dissolved in Germany. German participation in international organizations of these types should be forbidden.

11. The policy of deliberately withholding reparations of German factories and coal—thus preventing the economic recovery of the Allies—should be put to an end. Adequate reparations should be immediately allocated to Germany's victims. The rehabilitation of non-German European industry should have preference over the rehabilitation of German industry.

12. Germany should be given the opportunity to develop her own peaceful economy, but the revival of German prosperity constitutes the primary duty of the Germans and is in no way an obligation of the American taxpayer.

13. The privileged position of the Junkers' estates which enable the Junkers to continue as a political factor should be ended by expropriation, except in the case of proved anti-Nazis. These lands should be made available to peasants and other landless Germans with a view to maximize the production of food and other agricultural products.

14. Supervision of Germany's imports should be administered in order that Germany may never again be in a position to use her foreign trade as an instrument for the preparation of war.

15. Public or private loans or subsidies to German entities, public or private, should be prohibited, at least until the conclusion of a peace with Germany.

16. German assets in all United Nations and neutral countries shall be unearthed, marshalled, and vested in a reparation commission. The assets of Nazi victims shall be accepted. An inter-Allied and international agreement shall void all and every rule, law, and treaty which disposes otherwise. The proceeds of the liquidation of the German property shall be used in the first instance to compensate Nazi victims.

17. Allied nationals who have had, or still have, business or financial interests in Germany, directly or indirectly, or who have represented them as attorneys, should be eliminated from all posts in the Allied administration of Germany or any official capacity relating thereto.

18. In order to thwart the reestablishment of fifth columns, the infiltration of Nazi or German Fascist elements into other countries should be prevented by adequate screening of persons immigrating from Germany or from other countries and by controls imposed by individual countries on the admission of

Germans. Specifically, the United States should suspend the immigration quota from Germany for 12 years, save for victims or exiles from the Hitler regime.

19. In recognition of the fact that the democratization of Germany depends in the last analysis on German democratic forces, it is urged that the occupation powers screen out and appoint to all important positions Germans who first showed opposition to the Nazi regime.

That particular emphasis be placed on screening Germans in the intellectual professions and that known anti-Nazi intellectuals from Germany and countries formerly occupied by Germany be represented on the screening commission.

20. The decisions on Germany should be embodied in a statute to be imposed on Germany. The Germans should be permitted to sign a treaty only after Allied recognition of the democratization of the German people.

The National Conference on the German Problem makes these recommendations recognizing the urgent necessity at this time to support the implementation of those principles which were originally established by the Allies at the Crimean and Potsdam Conferences and illuminated by subsequent experience—as the basis for continued Allied unity.

The conference agreed to constitute itself a permanent body.

MONOPOLIES—ARTICLES BY RICHARD L. STROUT AND THOMAS L. STOKES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the basis of local self-government and of the existence of free competitive enterprise is being steadily undermined by the progress of economic concentration.

I have in my hand an article entitled "Mergers Through a Loophole," written by Richard L. Strout for the Christian Science Monitor, and an article entitled "Threat From the Right," written by Thomas L. Stokes. I ask that both these be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which has before it proposed legislation which would go far to correct the defects mentioned.

There being no objection, the articles were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

MERGERS THROUGH A LOOPHOLE

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—The United States was built by men who believed in individualism and competitive enterprise. For that reason, the concentration of economic power into great corporations has always caused concern. Big business almost inevitably means big labor unions and big government. Where the competition of free enterprise does not police an economic system, it is inevitable that Government should step in to preserve a democracy.

The Federal Trade Commission recently issued a special report showing that since 1940, 18,000 companies were swallowed up by big corporations through purchase and merger. One big drug concern, for example, absorbed 38 smaller companies, the companies swallowed including manufacturers of baby food, floor wax, paint, spaghetti, and insecticides. A loophole in the Clayton Anti-trust Act permits such a process which Congress intended to make illegal.

The Clayton Act passed in 1914. It was hailed as the doom of trusts. But trusts haven't been doomed. In fact, the process of building bigger and bigger corporations has gone on. This is because of a convenient loophole in the act. Congress believed that

monopolistic corporate mergers would be accomplished by one corporation purchasing the capital stock of another. Section 7 prohibited this. But this section was bypassed, and the plain intent of Congress defeated by another corporate device: The purchase of the physical assets of competitors, rather than their capital stock.

Company B sells its plant, machines, and facilities to Company A, and it then doesn't matter much whether it sells its stock certificates or not. The whole thing was legalized by a Supreme Court decision in 1926, in the *Western Meat Co.* case. It was a 5-to-4 decision, with Justices Brandeis, Taft, Holmes, and Stone all dissenting. Later the loophole was further widened by another decision, also 5 to 4.

The bipartisan Federal Trade Commission has unanimously recommended, every year since 1927, that this loophole be plugged. Congress hasn't acted. And the process of corporate expansion by merger has gone on. On March 4, the Federal Trade Commission, in a special report, pointed out with all the urgency at its command, the tremendous growth of corporate agglutination. President Truman, in his economic report to Congress made a specific recommendation for this amendment to section 7. Congress hasn't acted. The temporary National Economic Commission studied the matter carefully and made the same recommendation: Congress didn't act then either.

Now two Congressmen, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY (Democrat), of Wyoming, and Representative ESTES KEFAUVER (Democrat), of Tennessee, have again introduced a bill to plug the loophole. Only a sense of the way the old American tradition of free competition, free enterprise, and individual initiative is being endangered will make Congress act now.

Here is how the system works. A Chicago grocery corporation has just become the largest wholesale grocer in the United States, with total assets of \$20,000,000, and annual sales of \$100,000,000. It did so by acquiring the assets of three competing corporations.

The Federal Trade Commission brought suit under the Clayton Act. It wanted to protect the small grocers of the Nation. But it was shown that the big corporation had surrendered to the three competing corporations all of the capital stock which it has acquired from them, and received in lieu thereof an unconditional transfer of all their assets. After that, there was nothing for the FTC to do. It was all perfectly legal. It dismissed the complaint.

There is little chance of permanently reducing the size of the Federal Government in Washington, its bureaucracy and its police powers, so long as competition is reduced and corporations get bigger and bigger. For example, if there is one big interstate grocery wholesaler instead of several local ones, the pressure for comparable Federal control is almost inevitable, and so it goes. There is danger, too, for any democracy which allows economic concentration of power to spread at the expense of small business.

[From the Washington Daily News]

THREAT FROM THE RIGHT

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The Republican Congress faces a real challenge to do something about the increasing concentration of industrial control into fewer hands.

This represents a threat from the right, from ever-encroaching monopoly, that goes to the very basis of our democratic free-enterprise system. Too little attention has been paid to it thus far in the noisy clamor about the threat from the left.

Freedom can be lost more easily, probably, from the right, and less visibly, since it is

already so well entrenched in business and politics from precinct to National Government. Its powerful influence is plain in the current campaigns in Congress to restrict labor, not only directly in revision of the Wagner Act but indirectly in other ways. These include weakening the Wages and Hours Act, as well as attacks in spheres where the Government has set up protective devices for the consumer, among them public-power projects.

An object lesson in the growth of the economic power of big industry came in the recent Federal Trade Commission report showing that 1,000 smaller companies had been gobbled up by larger companies between 1940 and 1946. Concentration increased during the war and is expected to proceed at a greater pace, unless checked, as it did in the boom years after World War I.

Inconsistency in the approach to monopoly in Congress is revealed most glaringly in the proposal, for example, to forbid industry-wide bargaining. Labor was forced to this to meet the power of great industrial empires stretching over many States. No comparable plan to check the growth of monopoly is offered by those who are pressing for an end of industry-wide bargaining by labor.

There is, however, a proposal sponsored by two Democrats, Representative ESTES KEFAUVER (Tennessee) and Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY (Wyoming), to plug one loophole in our antimonopoly statutes. It was recommended, as well, by President Truman at the beginning of this Congress.

This is for amendment of the Clayton Act to forbid monopolistic mergers by purchase of assets as well as by purchase of stock. Purchase of stock was forbidden in the original act. But this was bypassed by mergers through purchase of assets. Every year since 1927 the Federal Trade Commission has recommended closing this loophole. In his appearance before the House Judiciary Committee, Representative KEFAUVER went to the root of the present alarming monopoly trend in urging his measure, now before that committee:

"The increased concentration of economic power is dooming free enterprise. The present trend of great corporations to increase their economic power is the antithesis of meritorious competitive development.

"It is no accident now that we have a big Government, big unions, and big business. The concentration of great economic power in a few corporations necessarily leads to the formation of large Nation-wide unions. The development of the two necessarily leads to big bureaus in the Government to deal with them.

"Through monopolistic mergers," the Congressman said, "the people are losing power to direct their own economic welfare.

"I am not an alarmist, but the history of what has taken place in other nations where mergers and concentrations have placed economic control in the hands of a few people is too clear to pass over easily. A point eventually is reached, and we are rapidly reaching it in this country, where the public steps in to take over when concentration and monopoly gain too much power.

"The taking over by the public through its Government always follows one or two methods and has one or two political results. It either results in a Fascist state or the nationalization of industries and thereafter a Communist state. Most businessmen realize this inevitable result. Certain monopolistic interests are being short-sighted in not appreciating the plight to which they are forcing the Government."

This is a timely warning.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Public Works, to which was re-

ferred the bill (S. 723) to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 82) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1000. A bill to confer civil rights upon Indian veterans of World Wars I and II; to remove restrictions on the property of such Indians; and for other purposes; and

S. 1001. A bill authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1002. A bill to establish the effective date of certain death pensions and death compensation payable by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1003. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Nuzzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. KNOWLAND introduced Senate bill 1004, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to provide that no person shall be appointed as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as general manager of such Commission until an investigation with respect to the character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which was referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1005. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1006. A bill to amend section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, as amended, so as to increase the acreage of sodium leases which may be issued in any State to a person, association, or corporation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1007. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to permit assignments of insurance benefits by widows or widowers who have remarried; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1008. A bill to amend title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 1009. A bill to extend the time within which the municipality of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, Fla., may consummate the purchase of the Coast Guard site (commonly known as the Base Six property) which is located at Fort Lauderdale; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate Joint Resolution 94, to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to recognize uncompensated services rendered the Nation under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FORT SUMTER NATIONAL MONUMENT, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina.

I might say that I have discussed this matter with War Department officials and the Secretary of War, and they are very agreeable to it. I ask that the chairman of the committee to which the joint resolution will be referred will expedite it as much as possible.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94) to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

UNITED DEMOCRATIC STATES OF EUROPE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution expressing the conviction of Congress that there should be created a United Democratic States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations.

I request that a statement I have prepared on this subject may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the creation of a United Democratic States of Europe, within the framework of the United Nations, to consist of nations which respect the political, economical, social, and religious liberties of their respective citizens.

The statement presented by Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION OF BILL FOR UNITED DEMOCRATIC STATES OF EUROPE

I am introducing today a concurrent resolution to express the conviction of Congress that there be formed a United Democratic States of Europe within the United Nations.

The resolution reads as follows:

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the creation of a United Democratic States of Europe, within the framework of the United Nations, to consist of nations which respect the political, economical, social, and religious liberties of their respective citizens."

I propose that if this resolution be passed, it not be a dead letter but rather that the United States State Department policy lend every encouragement to this resolution's realization. This is not idealism nor mere verbalism; it is realism, as I see it, required by our times—realism for peace, progress, and plenty.

In introducing this resolution, I am merely renewing a recommendation which I have repeatedly made over the years to the effect that the time is long overdue for those countries of Europe which are economically, politically and socially democratic in spirit

and in practice to unite in order to realize progressively the great advantages of union enjoyed by the United States of America. Such a union would consist basically, as I see it, of England, France, Switzerland, Finland, Norway, Sweden, Holland, Belgium, and Denmark, as well as possibly other countries.

WHY UNITED STATES ADVISE

It is not, of course, for the United States to tell or order any of these European nations what should be their national policy. However, in view of the fact that we have already spent some 400,000 lives of our young men and several hundred billion dollars of our resources (to mention the cost of but one of two world wars) for the preservation of European democracy, it seems to me we do have a right to submit our respectful recommendations along this line to these nations.

WHY NOT A UNION OF ALL EUROPE?

My resolution differs from one previously introduced, which would invite the establishment of a United Nations of Europe. I do not feel that if all the nations of Europe, in their present heterogeneous stage of development, were simply to combine together, the interests of peace and progress would be served.

Thus, in view of the fact that Europe is so sharply divided between the camps of democracy and dictatorship, with all sorts of shadings in between, it is a farce to speak of any effective union between, for example, the people of Scandinavia and the foreign-dominated peoples of the Soviet satellite states. A democratic-dictator hodge-podge of United Nations of Europe would experience the same frustrations and stumbling blocks that we are experiencing in the United Nations.

It is my deep and honest hope, however, that all the nations of Europe may be eventually brought into the United Democratic States of Europe through gradual changes in their political and economic processes.

REASONS FOR UNITED DEMOCRATIC STATES OF EUROPE

The basic reasons for my resolution are the following:

1. If these nations are to join in political union, with common citizenship, without losing their respective governments, although surrendering some of their separate prerogatives, they would be helping to assure their common political defense against the ideological warfare waged against them by dictator states. They would evidence to Russia the vitality of democracy.

2. If we are to extend some \$400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey as a step to halt the spread of communism, it seems to me that a movement for political union of democracies begun from within the respective states involved would be entirely consistent with and would be of aid to our loan program.

3. They could formulate military plans against any potential aggressor.

4. If these countries will strive toward a customs union, that is, toward the breaking down of trade barriers between them, (which cannot, of course, be accomplished overnight), European recovery will be furthered as well as the recovery of these separate nations.

5. If these countries are to unite, they will set an inspiring example, not only for the peoples of all Allied countries from which freedom has been driven, but particularly for a former enemy people such as Germany.

CONCLUSION

I know and deeply respect the pride of the various democratic nations of Europe in their own institutions. But because of their perilous collective condition, it seems to me that this proposal is not inconsistent with such pride but is to their own self-advantage.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment intended to be proposed by me to S. 938, to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and that it be printed for the information of the Senate. The amendment is very short, and I shall read it:

No assistance shall be furnished under this act which shall have the object (a) of promoting the continuance or expansion of any totalitarian purpose or goal, whether communistic or fascistic; or (b) of rejecting the proposition that individuals have inalienable rights and must be both free and the masters of their government.

This amendment does three things:

First. It makes it crystal clear that the aid provided in this bill will not be used to promote ideologies which are hateful to us. Many Americans resented the aid extended last year to countries under Communist domination who were in some cases receiving our aid while shooting and killing American personnel.

Second. It shows that we are against fascism, which is but another type of totalitarianism which some persons fear to see raise its head in the Near East.

Third. It proclaims our intention at least to do no violence to the ideals of democracy. Although we shall naturally not attempt to force democracy down anyone's throat, we do hope that it will prosper in these countries. We have a basically idealistic purpose in adopting this policy. We would be neither fair to ourselves nor frank with the world if our idealism were not given specific recognition in the terms of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have modified one of the amendments which I submitted last week, and I offer a new draft of the same amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, because I think it is important, in view of the nature of the discussion in the country in respect to Senate bill 938, entitled "A bill to aid Greece and Turkey," I wish to submit an amendment, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and for the information of the Senate and the country, I wish to read it:

The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances: (1) if requested by any government of Greece or Turkey representing a majority of the people of either such nation; (2) if requested by a procedural vote—

Which, I interpolate, is a vote without veto—

if requested by a procedural vote in the Security Council or a majority vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations; (3) if the President finds that the purposes of the act have been substantially accomplished or are incapable of satisfactory accomplishment.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit, by way of preliminary comment, that if such an amendment is put into the bill there can be no further remote suggestion, on the one hand, of any violation of the autonomy of either of these particular countries, or, on the other hand, any violation of the authority of the United Nations, or any disposition to elude its authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Without objection, the amendment will be received, as in legislative session, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG submitted an amendment, Mr. LODGE submitted two amendments, and Mr. MURRAY submitted nine amendments, intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, which were severally referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

SECRET TREATIES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Secret Treaties," from the March 26, 1947, edition of the Omaha Evening World Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR SECRET TREATIES

Now we know.

The commitments made in our names at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam have been revealed.

In full, the State Department says. The secret drawers which contained them have been opened all the way.

Free Americans will hope that this action, belated as it is, may be accepted as tacit assurance that the practice of entering into secret treaties has been abandoned, that since Potsdam the Government at Washington has followed constitutional processes in its dealings with other nations.

The Constitution is quite explicit about the handling of such matters.

It says:

"He (the President) shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur . . ."

Nothing there about "pacts" negotiated by the Chief Executive, nothing about "protocols" which would make the United States a party to scheme to plunder the riches of other nations.

"By and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Thirty Presidents had understood the meaning of that passage and had followed its bidding. Franklin Roosevelt, the thirty-first, and Harry Truman, the thirty-second, chose to ignore it.

It has been the contention of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman and their inner-circle friends that the "pacts," "protocols," etc., which they made were military agreements among Allies and were not treaties in the ordinary sense.

With respect to some of the agreements made, there is validity to that argument. At Tehran, for example, there was talk of trying to get Turkey into the war, and discussion of the impending invasion of Europe by Eisenhower's armies. That was military stuff and it was rightly kept secret.

But at Tehran it was also decided that the Western Allies would sacrifice Mihailovich in Yugoslavia and throw their support to Stalin's man, Tito. And while legally it may have been presented as a military deci-

sion, in actuality it was a political concession. In effect Churchill and Roosevelt were saying to Stalin, "You can take Yugoslavia to have and to hold, now and forever. If they received anything in return, it has not yet been revealed."

Whether the United States has the right to dispose of the sovereign power of another, and friendly, nation under any circumstances is a most serious problem. But certainly the Constitution does not confer any such right on the President alone, acting on his own motion without conferring with the Senate.

The most spectacular flouting of the American Constitution, however, took place at Yalta.

There the three Chiefs of State—Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin—agreed:

1. The status quo of Outer Mongolia (a Communist status quo) should be maintained.

2. Russia's rights in Asia, as they existed prior to the war of 1904, should be restored.

3. Russia should take all of Sakhalin Island.

4. The Kurile Islands shall be handed over to the Soviet Union.

And then came the most heavy-handed example of power politics to be found anywhere in the pacts:

"It is understood that the agreement concerning Outer Mongolia and the ports and railroads referred to above will require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin."

The words are Roosevelt's, Churchill's, and Stalin's.

It has been said that, in making these lavish promises, President Roosevelt was trying to purchase Marshal Stalin's help in the closing phases of the war against Japan.

But if that was the case the President overlooked and failed to use the bargaining power that had been placed in his hands by lend-lease.

We were shipping war materials by the billions of dollars' worth to Russia. In response to Stalin's repeated demands we were planning an invasion of the Continent. We could have demanded in return that Russia eventually do whatever might be necessary to bring about the defeat of Japan.

But we didn't. Instead, the President, acting secretly in our name, made commitments which he had no constitutional right to make and which today cynically make us a party to Communist seizure of populations and resources on two continents.

There is one honorable way of escape from the predicament in which we have been placed. That is to serve notice on the other signatories that, under the American Constitution, we are obliged to repudiate all international agreements made secretly by a President, save only those agreements which actually were germane to the fighting of the war and are now facts accomplished.

Such a notice, if given now, probably would not greatly change the map of the world. Soviet Russia is already entrenched in the areas which were ceded to her by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill.

But at least such an action would advise the smaller nations of the earth, those whose friends we say we are, that as a people we regret having been a party to an imperialistic division of the world. And that henceforth we propose to conduct our foreign affairs in public, in accordance with our Constitution and the ideals of free men.

METHOD OF ELECTING PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Right Way," published in the Boston Post, of March 21, 1947, and an editorial entitled "Mr. Lodge's Amendment," published in the New Bedford (Mass.) Stand-

ard Times, of March 23, 1947, both relating to the proposed constitutional amendment providing for the election of the President and Vice President by popular vote, which appear in the Appendix.]

INDUSTRIAL MILITARY POTENTIALS—ARTICLE BY DR. LEIFUR MAGNUSSON

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Comparative Industrial Military Potential of Different Countries," by Dr. Leifur Magnusson, Assistant Director of the Department of Research, Industrial College of the Armed Forces, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR UNITED STATES CONCILIATION SERVICE—LETTER FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter relating to the reduction of appropriations for the United States Conciliation Service, published in the New York Times, of March 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TARIFF PROTECTION ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS—ARTICLE FROM THE FARMERS GUILD NEWS

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Senator BUTLER Fights Farm Tariff Cuts," published in the Farmers Guild News for February-March 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. LEWIS' MEMORIAL—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Lewis' Memorial," published in the Washington Star, of March 31, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THEORY AND COMPOSITION OF OUR ARMED FORCES—EDITORIAL FROM ARMY ORDNANCE MAGAZINE

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the subject of the theory and composition of our armed forces, published in the Army Ordnance magazine for March-April 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACTIVITIES OF THE GREEK ROYALISTS—ARTICLE FROM PM

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How Monarchists Ruined Greek Economy," published in the March 31, 1947, issue of PM, which appears in the Appendix.]

COST OF POSTWAR AID—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to American expenditures for postwar aid, written by Bertram D. Hulien, and published in the New York Times of March 30, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES—EDITORIAL FROM THE NASHVILLE BANNER

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relative to Communist activities in the United States, published in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of March 27, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM THE LAKE COUNTY (TENN.) BANNER

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Federal Aid and Hot Lunches,"

published in the March 28, 1947, issue of the Lake County Banner, of Tiptonville, Tenn., which appears in the Appendix.]

END OF SUGAR CONTROLS—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Congress Takes a Long-Shot Bet on Sugar," published in the Washington Daily News of March 31, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GRAIN SITUATION

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter and an analysis sent to him by the National Association of Commodity Exchanges and Allied Trades, dealing with the current grain situation, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title II, of the Second War Powers Act.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, at the recess of the Senate on Friday afternoon I had not completed my remarks relative to the confirmation of the nominees of the President of the United States for membership on the Atomic Energy Commission. It is not my intention to repeat the information which I presented then, but for the benefit of those who were not here at that time, I shall briefly review the situation and then proceed to cover the ground that I had not yet touched upon. For those who desire more complete information, I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Friday.

The development of atomic power is one of the most important subjects with which our people have been faced during the entire period of our history. Never before have we had a problem in our hands which if mishandled could result in the destruction of civilization as we know it. For better or for worse we are in the atomic age and there can be no turning back of the hands of the clock. There should be no procrastination in meeting the very urgent problems with which we are confronted.

This is not information which can be locked in a safe-deposit box and permanently withheld from the rest of the world. What one nation and one group of scientists can discover and develop, other nations given time, resources, and industrial capacity will develop. The only thing that we have is the atomic bomb, the industrial capacity for the production of atomic power, plus an unknown amount of time.

Those who are best informed on the subject agree that our exclusive possession, if indeed it is exclusive now, of the first two factors I have mentioned,

is limited by the amount of time which remains to us before some other nation or nations shall have closed the gap. This time element may be 2 years or it may be 10 years or some period in between, but at some place within those relatively narrow limits we can be almost certain that what we like to think of now as an exclusive possession will no longer be such.

Once other nations have developed this source of power and this weapon of destruction, neither we nor our children will have any real tranquillity, nor do I believe that a world engaged in an atomic armament race could be a world in which freedom and free enterprise as we know it could exist. By the very nature of our Government and our people we would not use the weapon against others in aggressive warfare. I have no such confidence that others once having gained the power would not use it against us.

Of one thing we can be relatively certain. If the world is so unfortunate as to have a war in the atomic age where this terrible weapon of destruction will be used, there will be no period of several years for the United States to prepare itself and to arm our allies overseas. Twice in my generation the world has seen the United States furnish the logistical and manpower support which enabled our allies and ourselves to change the tide from the ebb of defeat to the flood of victory.

Any future potential aggressor nation with world-wide lust for power will first deliver a super Pearl Harbor attack against this Nation, its industrial capacity, and its means of communications. It is conceivable that such a blow might be so devastating that if it did not become a complete knockout, it would at least incapacitate us from recovering sufficiently and soon enough to be a determining factor in preventing our allies or potential allies from being engulfed.

Hence it seems clear that during the time that is left, this Nation should make every effort to secure adequate international control of atomic energy. Adequate control requires not only the most complete type of inspection and control over the raw materials that go into the development of atomic power but over the industrial facilities which are part of the development. In addition to this it should be obvious to every American as well as to all others interested in a sound system of international law and order that should a potential aggressor nation violate in any degree the inspection and regulatory system, there must be no obstacle to immediate action against the violator. As long as a veto exists in its present form in the United Nations, no such action could be taken by the forces supporting international law and order. Mr. Bernard Baruch who represented us on the United Nations agency dealing with this subject fully recognized this fundamental fact.

Until and unless these adequate and complete international safeguards are established, this Nation must not surrender either the secrets of atomic energy which we still possess or the industrial know-how without which the blueprints

and calculations cannot be turned into atomic energy or the atomic bomb.

Once a nation has embarked upon a program of the production of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, it is 80 percent on the road to the production of the atomic bomb. Of this fact sight has been lost by many, including Mr. Henry Wallace.

We have made a generous and a far-reaching proposal to the other nations of the world relative to the international control of this vast and destructive power. It is not something that some can accept and others reject. It is not something that we can disclose to some and withhold from others. We must know soon, very soon, whether it is to be accepted or rejected.

It is my opinion that the Government will not and must not compromise the essential protective features of the Baruch proposal. If the Administration should do so—and I do not believe the executive branch of the Government will—it would not have the support of the Congress. If the Congress should permit any such compromise—and I am sure that it will not—it would not have the approval of the Nation.

Hence we come inevitably to the point relative to the security of our Nation where the only alternative to adequate international safeguards will be in this Nation keeping far ahead of all other nations in the field of nuclear science and in the development of atomic power in all its phases.

This brings us face to face with the matter now pending before the Senate.

When VJ-day came, this country had an efficient atomic organization and tremendous resources in scientists and in other necessary manpower available not only to continue the production of that which was known but also to follow the old American custom of not being satisfied with what we had already accomplished. We shall go on to explore and develop unknown fields.

The natural let-down that came with VJ-day, the long debate relative to the type of atomic control which this Nation would have, and the subsequent uncertainties growing out of the nonconfirmation to date of the members of the Commission who were appointed last October, has caused delays which are detrimental to this Nation's security and which if continued could be fatal.

The members of the Atomic Energy Commission and the general managers were appointed last October by the President of the United States under authority of legislation passed by the Congress. The Congress recognized that this great potential source of power for good or evil by its very nature would have to be under the control of the Government even in this land of free enterprise. There was not then, and by the nature of things there cannot be now, an alternative to such domestic control of atomic power.

Since midnight on December 31 the entire facilities of the Manhattan district with all its ramifications have been turned over to the Atomic Energy Commission. Most, if not all, of the secrets that were in the hands of General Groves and his associates of the Manhattan

project are now and have been in the hands of Mr. Lillenthal and his associates on the Atomic Energy Commission. Pursuant to Public Law 585 (the Atomic Energy Act), the President on December 31, 1946, by Executive Order 9816, directed the transfer to the Atomic Energy Commission of all fissionable material, atomic weapons, facilities for producing fissionable material or atomic-energy devices, and all Government-owned records concerning atomic energy. No rejection by the Senate can change this fact.

In order to correct what I believe to be a serious defect in the existing law, I have had prepared and today will introduce a bill amending the Atomic Energy Act by providing that in the future the President shall not submit to the Senate for confirmation for appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission the name of any individual until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made and submitted to the President a full report on the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual.

Should the Senate reject these nominations or approve of the flank attack motion to recommit to committee, which is tantamount to rejection, irreparable damage to this nation would, in my opinion, result in at least three major respects: First, it would result in a considerable additional loss of time and we have not much time to spare. Second, the damage to the morale of the scientists working in the atomic project directly and cooperating with it on the outside would be tremendous—far greater than one cares to speak or even think about. Third, atomic energy is not only a major domestic problem but by its very nature is world wide in scope. Our action on the floor of the Senate is being closely followed by every nation on the face of the earth. A repudiation by the Senate of the United States of the President's appointments would do such incalculable harm that I have grave doubt whether the subsequent passage of the Greek loan legislation, the peace treaties, or any other action which we might later take could offset the damage.

These reasons alone are sufficient to cause me not only to vote for confirmation but to make such contribution as is within my power to assure confirmation by this body.

As I pointed out on Friday last, if there had been any question in my mind as to the loyalty of any of these men to the Government of the United States or to the Constitution of our country, I would not have supported them in committee or on the floor of the Senate. I reiterate that there is not one bit of evidence that supports directly or indirectly any such theory. These men are not Communists or Communist sympathizers. They are patriotic American citizens.

For approximately 5 weeks the Senate section of the Atomic Energy Committee, consisting of five Republicans and four Democrats, listened to the testimony of the nominees themselves and of other witnesses. During that period of time we were able to examine and cross examine all who appeared before us. We

had additional sources of information open to us.

I reiterate that to date no new evidence of a substantial nature has been presented to the Senate that was not available to the committee when the nominations were before it. By a vote of 8 to 1 the committee recommends the confirmation of Mr. Lillenthal.

In a matter of this kind it is fitting and proper that the Senate should proceed with diligence. I have previously cited some overwhelming reasons which seem to me to warrant prompt confirmation of Mr. Lillenthal and his associates on the Atomic Energy Commission.

In addition, I believe that David Lillenthal is well qualified for the position of Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

There has been the question raised on the floor of the Senate by one or more of my colleagues on this side of the aisle as to whether Mr. Lillenthal is the most qualified man for the position. I do not know that any man could honestly answer that question in either the affirmative or the negative. This is a new field of activity in which no man, by the very nature of things, has had experience.

I have no hesitation in saying, however, that I believe that Mr. Lillenthal has qualities which would place him in the top category of the candidates for the position in the field that the President had available to choose from.

Under the act itself it is provided that those who serve on the Commission must disassociate themselves from all business activities. The exact language is:

No member of the Commission shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment than that of serving as a member of the Commission.

It has been reported to me—and I believe the information is reliable—that the President sought to interest several other high-caliber men and was not successful in so doing.

It is understandable how, during wartime, men with other responsibilities will make the necessary sacrifices to take on Government positions, and yet, when peace comes, they are reluctant to do so. Part of this, of course, is due to the fact that positions carrying equal or less responsibility pay much better in private industry than in government. Part of it, we must be frank to admit, grows out of a perfectly natural reluctance to go through the harassment that we in Congress sometimes put our public officials up against.

I make no criticisms of the Congress and its committees in making searching inquiries. We understand that it is a necessary part of our responsibilities. We must get factual information on which to base our decisions on legislation or on national policy. Yet, from the point of view of a busy executive, it is understandable how he can sometimes question the necessity for the duplication of committee hearings which we sometimes inflict upon those who also have their jobs to do.

At any rate, the President of the United States did appoint Mr. Lillenthal as Chairman of the Commission. In his

letter to the chairman of our committee, the President, in his reply of March 1, 1947, had this to say:

For your information, be advised that the records of the investigation agencies of the executive branch of the Government were checked at the time the appointees in question were named to the Commission. No derogatory information was contained in any report. Before answering your letter of February 25, I have had a current check made of the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Army and Navy Intelligence Departments, and the Intelligence section of the Manhattan District, and I wish to advise you that no derogatory information with reference to any of their appointments to the Commission, or with reference to the general management of the Commission, is contained in the files of these agencies.

Now this is the statement of the President of the United States, an able and distinguished former Member of the Senate. Upon him had been placed the terrible final decision on the dropping of the atomic bombs at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Unless one wants to raise a question as to whether the President of the United States would be careless in appointments of this kind when he has full knowledge not only of the destructive capacity of the atomic bomb, but also full knowledge of the efforts and resources that went into its development and use, it would seem to me that his word should be sufficient.

Mr. Lillenthal as Chairman of the TVA has had more experience than any other available man in operating a Government agency of the general type and character of the Atomic Energy Commission. I refer to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The qualifications that make him objectionable to some make him appear to me to be a man who would be well suited for the tremendous task at hand.

Very often businessmen or attorneys coming into Government for the first time from private life are lost in the maze of what we sometimes call Government bureaucracy, or they become discouraged from what seems to be and often is an endless amount of red tape; or after being in Government for a relatively short period of time they take themselves and their experience into private business where the remuneration is many times greater.

To the contrary, in Mr. Lillenthal we have a man who has devoted a considerable period of his adult life to the public service as a member of the Wisconsin utilities commission, as a member and later Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and now as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. He has demonstrated an interest in and a willingness to serve his country. He has demonstrated that he is a real public servant who feels that in Government he can make a contribution to the public welfare.

Now what are some of these qualifications. Friday I pointed out that Mr. Baruch said:

Mr. Lillenthal I have known for some time and I think he is a well-qualified man. He is a man of prodigious energy, of driving force. I think sometimes that in his conception of his duty he drives exceedingly hard.

Mr. President, I submit that this is just the type of man one needs in order to restimulate the development of atomic power and to bring this activity back to its high degree of productivity and to advance research in unexplored fields.

My capable colleague the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], in a speech on the floor of the Senate on March 26, read into the RECORD some quotations from the philosophy of Mr. Lillenthal relative to management. Among the quotes read at that time was the following:

The tradition and climate of the skill of management, however, are remote from all such negation. Management is affirmative and initiatory. This is to be done. It is in the process of defining, with skill and sense, what is to be done, and with it the fixing of responsibility for results, with wide freedom of judgment in the managers as to how it may best be done, that you have the essence of the best form of modern management.

What apparently my distinguished colleague from Michigan thinks is derogatory to Mr. Lillenthal I feel is a distinct asset. If there was ever a place where we needed someone with the capacity to say "This is to be done" and who would push on to get results, this is certainly the place and it appears to be that this is the man.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Not at this time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not the language "this shall be done"?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Certainly American business has developed over the years because management in private enterprise has developed along the same lines.

I certainly mean no disrespect to the Congress of the United States when I say that few if any businesses could survive the bickering and the delay which often result from some of our activities.

Private enterprise could not survive the wide changes of policy for which we in the Government are sometimes responsible. One year we expand Government activities and Government services. The next year we make such drastic curtailments that we not only are apt to destroy the morale of loyal public employees but also to disrupt completely the services we have established resulting in a loss of investments already made. How many businesses could stand such wide sweeps of the pendulum of policy? I know of none.

Last November I went down into Tennessee Valley to see that activity for myself. I had heard a great deal about it in the past, and had read much about it. I was favorably impressed with the high caliber of the men I met in the Tennessee Valley Authority organization. I was even more impressed with the high regard the public had for the job that was and is being done.

The people in the Tennessee Valley were in no sense captivated by ideas of a super State or of the control by Government of our free enterprise system. To the contrary they were as stout believers in the American system of free enterprise as will be found in any part of the Nation.

Far from trying to control their community life or their individual businesses, the TVA had in effect thrown them the ball, and it was the job of the local community and the individual citizens to carry it.

The TVA had aided in the development of waterways, flood control and new sources of power. It had assisted in the development of fertilizers and in the demonstration of the effectiveness of their constructive use. It had been alive to the possibilities of the development of demonstration projects for a range of activities from quick freezing to the development of new uses for wood products. But the important thing to keep in mind is that these studies and developments were made available to private capital and private enterprise that established themselves throughout the valley. This not only resulted in diversified industries but it furnished new markets for the farmers so that agriculture would not be dependent upon one or two major crops for the economic health of the Tennessee Valley. Along with the other activities a great deal of work has been done relative to the prevention of soil erosion—again with encouragement given to the individual to carry the ball once he had the best information available to him as to how it could be done.

In carrying on his obligations as Chairman of the TVA, I believe that Mr. Lillenthal made a great contribution to the American way of life. What he accomplished was within the letter and the spirit of the TVA Act. But the energy of the man and the inspiration that he gave to his associates transformed legal phrases and policies on paper into a dynamic actuality which meant better farms, more industries, more jobs and a better way of life.

While some may feel that his experience in the TVA disqualifies him for the chairmanship of the Atomic Energy Commission, I feel that it is one of the strong points in his favor.

By this I do not mean that I see eye to eye with Mr. Lillenthal on all his beliefs, economic or political. To the contrary, we no doubt are in disagreement at many places along the line.

As a member of the Atomic Energy Committee I have vigorously expressed myself as being in disagreement with certain of the policies of the Commission.

From time to time, as a member of the joint committee charged with the responsibility of liaison between the Commission and the Congress, I shall not hesitate to oppose any policy or contemplated action which I believe to be not in line with the congressional will or sound national policy. Without pretending to speak for the other members of the committee, I am certain that they will not hesitate to likewise vigorously express their views to the Commission and to the Congress.

This will be done under section 15 (b) of the act which states:

The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy. The Commission shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to the Commission's activities.

Let there be no doubt in anyone's mind as to the necessity for adequate safeguards of information. Section 10 of the act provides:

Whoever, lawfully or unlawfully, having possession of, access to, control over, or being entrusted with, any document, writing, sketch, photograph, plan, model, instrument, appliance, note, or information involving or incorporating restricted data (A) communicates, transmits, or discloses the same to any individual or person, or attempts or conspires to do any of the foregoing, with intent to injure the United States or with intent to secure an advantage to any foreign nation, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by death or imprisonment for life.

The law further provides:

(ii) Except as authorized by the Commission in case of emergency, no individual shall be employed by the Commission until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation and report to the Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual.

To carry out this provision and other security regulations an initial transfer of \$1,000,000 from the Atomic Energy Commission's funds to the Federal Bureau of Investigation was made in November 1946, and later an additional \$4,000,000 was transferred to the FBI for the same purpose.

The acting members of the Atomic Energy Commission are fully alive to the grave responsibilities that rest upon them, not only in the vital field of security but also in the operation of existing facilities and in research and development. Within a very short time the budget requests and appropriations will have to be provided if the United States is to maintain its position in the field of atomic power.

For the reasons I have cited Friday and today and for others I cannot now discuss, I believe that the facts are overwhelming on the side of prompt confirmation of the Presidential nominees.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I am confused by the issue presented by the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If I am correctly informed, the committee of which the Senator from California is a member met for a period of more than five consecutive weeks?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. And the members of the committee attended all its sessions?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. And all the charges which have been suggested on the floor were aired before that committee?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. And at the conclusion of the examination of all the witnesses the vote was 8 to 1 for confirmation, as I recall.

Mr. KNOWLAND. On the Lillenthal nomination.

Mr. SMITH. I am wondering what is the significance of the motion that the whole matter be recommitted to the committee and also that the FBI be asked to investigate the nominees, when apparently the committee has gone into the subject fully. I understood from the Senator's statement that the President had assured him that these names had

been cleared by the FBI; and unless the Senator wishes to repudiate the President's statement to him, that would seem to be the controlling factor in the situation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The communication from the President of the United States stated that prior to the time they were appointed a check had been made from the files of the FBI, the Army and Navy Intelligence, and the other agencies which he had at his disposal, and that after receiving the letter from the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], a recheck of the files had been made and that no derogatory information had been included in any of those files.

Mr. SMITH. What troubles me is this: It seems to me that the motion of the Senator from Ohio is an appeal to the Senate from the committee which held the hearings, and from the evidence before the committee. It is asking the Senate to refer the matter back as though it had no confidence in the committee. I am bound to say that when I read the names of the distinguished members of the committee I should hesitate a long time before I would vote lack of confidence in the ability, judgment, and sincerity of the members of the committee, who are as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Only the Senator from Ohio voted in the negative.

On the particular issue of the motion that is what troubles me. It seems to me that recommitting the nominations could only delay the settlement of a matter which is demanding immediate attention.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator is absolutely correct. As I pointed out in my remarks, I believe that a vote to recommit is tantamount to a vote for rejection.

I will say to the distinguished Senator that I feel there is perhaps a loophole in the Senate's practice relative to appointments of members of commissions, including the Atomic Energy Commission, which has concerned me greatly, and I tried to point it out during the course of my remarks. The Commission was appointed, under the law, in October and November of last year. On December 31 the Manhattan Project, with all its ramifications and all the information, was turned over to the Commission, so that actually the nominees have been operating as a commission during the intervening period from January until this time, approximately the 1st of April, without Senate confirmation. I had requested the Legislative Counsel to draft legislation which I thought would close the loophole so that the Commission could not operate until the nominations of its members had been confirmed by the Senate, which I think would be a far

better procedure, especially in the field of atomic power.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator. Mr. KNOWLAND. But we ran up against the Constitution of the United States. Of course, at the time the Constitution was drafted and adopted the country had no knowledge of atomic power and its ramifications. In article II of the Constitution we find this language:

The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate by granting commissions which shall expire at the end of their next session.

The Legislative Counsel advises that there is no way to require confirmation prior to their taking over.

Then it seemed to me it would be wise to apply—and I am presenting such an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act—to the members of the Commission the same rule which is now applied to employees of the Commission; that is, to make it mandatory that an investigation shall be made by the FBI, the results of which shall be turned over to the President and to the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy prior to any appointment being made. I believe that from a constitutional standpoint, that can be done.

Mr. SMITH. To amplify my point, that would mean that all officers and employees heretofore appointed by the Commission would be checked by the FBI automatically?

Mr. KNOWLAND. So far as employees are concerned, they are now covered by the existing statute; but the statute does not provide for a mandatory check by the FBI of Presidential appointees.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent, as in legislative session, to introduce the bill to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1004) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to provide that no person shall be appointed as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as general manager of such Commission until an investigation with respect to the character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, introduced by Mr. KNOWLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. KNOWLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a copy of the bill I introduced earlier today proposing an amendment to the Atomic Energy Act.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1004) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to provide that no person shall be appointed as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission or as general manager of such Commission until an investigation with respect to the character, associations, and loyalty of such person shall have been made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) paragraph (2) of section 2 (a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is amended by striking out the second sentence in such paragraph and inserting in

lieu thereof the following: "No individual shall be appointed as a member of the Commission until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation and report to the President on the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual. In submitting any nomination to the Senate, the President shall set forth the experience and the qualifications of the nominee and shall make available to the Senate Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a report of such investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

(b) Subparagraph (A) of paragraph (4) of such section is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "No individual shall be appointed as General Manager until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation and report to the President on the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual. In submitting any nomination to the Senate, the President shall set forth the experience and the qualifications of the nominee and shall make available to the Senate Members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a report of such investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to ask a question. At the close of the Senator's remarks he gave this citation from the law:

No individual shall be employed by the Commission until the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall have made an investigation and report to the Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of such individual.

I ask whether or not the record shows that after this Commission was appointed and organized, all its present employees, or employees at any time, were investigated by the FBI and reports thereon were made to the Commission?

Mr. KNOWLAND. In answer to the Senator's question I wish to point out that in the first place, the Senator must examine the whole problem with which they were faced. They took over from the Army the Manhattan project in all its ramifications. There is a specific provision further on in the act that those who were in the Manhattan project could be continued in their employment. As to the other employees, it is my information that in conformity with the act, the FBI was asked to report on all of them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the FBI so report; and if so, has the Senate committee seen the reports?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it was very clearly pointed out the other day by my colleague, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], that it was not the job of the committee to go through the many hundreds or ultimately thousands of reports on individual employees of the Manhattan project, because that is an administrative job; but he did request certain information regarding certain of the employees; and those reports were, at his request, furnished to the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Were they put into the record?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me? I can clear up this point,

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to know whether the reports were put into the record.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, they were not put into the record, and the committee never contemplated putting into the record reports of such a confidential nature as were made by that agency. The committee did ask for the full investigatory reports on approximately 15 or 20 of the key personnel of the Commission. In each case the complete report was furnished to the committee. The committee still has in its possession those original reports, and the committee examined the original reports and asked that a short digest be made of some of the reports in which some matters of interest might be developed. That was done.

I say to the Senator from Michigan that I think it is completely inadvisable, and would defeat the very purpose of the investigatory agency of the Government, to have confidential and extensive reports on the minutiae of the past, present, and future of every person employed, made a matter of public record. For one reason, certain sources of information would immediately be closed if those reports were made public. It would be practically impossible for the FBI or the Army Intelligence Service or the Navy Intelligence Service to acquire information about various persons if the sources of the information were to be made public and were to be spread all over the public records of this body.

Therefore the committee had to assume the responsibility, and did and does assume the responsibility, of saying to the Senate that a thorough combing of those reports was made, and that reports and digests were prepared only in the case of certain instances involving matters which the committee was quite certain would be of interest to the committee, or matters that might not have been clearly established as being above criticism and objection. We have the complete reports. I forget the exact number of them, but they relate to 16 or 17 of the key, controlling administrative officials of the Commission.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to ask a further question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] inserted in the RECORD a paraphrase of those reports. I assume that the Senator from Iowa is familiar with that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; as to about four or five persons.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the committee make any further search to ascertain why Mr. Marks was not able to obtain a commission in the Navy? He is the chief counsel for the Commission.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the circumstances are these, and they were discussed the other day: Our special committee has no authority, I am convinced, to command the services of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As I pointed out the other day, the joint committee does have such authority, beyond any question. But the matter we

are now discussing is not a joint committee action. When the question concerning Mr. Marks came up, the material was digested and submitted, along with other matters which might have raised some doubt in the minds of the members of the committee. The committee asked that this file be sent back for recheck and reexamination. It was so sent back, through the proper channels.

The report came back to us with about 10 or 12 additional pages, but in the language or the conclusions or the ultimate statements contained in the new review there was no change from the old review. It stands now as it did then, with substantially the same language, and that is the language in the record.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to ask whether the committee saw fit to call or did call anyone from the Navy, to ascertain why the general counsel of the Commission was not permitted to obtain a Navy commission. I should like to have the RECORD show that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The answer is "No," Mr. President. We did not call anyone from the Navy on that point.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask the Senator from California if he knows whether other appointments to high positions in the Government are customarily investigated by the FBI before the nominations are acted upon by the Senate. Was the recent appointment to the Securities and Exchange Commission investigated by the FBI, or was the recent appointment to the Maritime Commission investigated by the FBI? Are the American representatives on the international organizations set up within the United Nations investigated by the FBI? If they are not, I should like to know why there is this sudden demand for an FBI investigation of one David E. Lillenthal. Why should such a demand happen to come at this time, although there has been no open demand for such an investigation of other appointees, such as the ones I have mentioned, any one of whom could do irreparable harm to our country if he were so minded.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say that in respect to judicial appointments of Federal district judges and United States attorneys, I believe it is customary for the Department of Justice to make an examination and investigation of the appointees, and its report resulting therefrom is made available, at times, I understand, if not to the full committee, at least to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I do not believe it is the customary practice to make an investigation of the type the Senator has suggested, in regard to other high Government officials and employees.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. However, in all fairness, I should say that, of course, we are dealing here with a subject the very nature of which might well warrant, and in my opinion would warrant, a more thorough investigation than perhaps

would be given in the case of most Presidential appointees.

Mr. AIKEN. But it is apparent that any one of a dozen appointees of the President could do a great deal of harm to their country if they were so minded.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is absolutely correct about that.

Mr. AIKEN. I see no reason why they should not be subject to investigation, just as much as Mr. Lillenthal and his associates are. I cannot see any comparison between 50 percent of loyalty to one's country and 100 percent loyalty. If they are disloyal in any degree, or if they are in a position to be disloyal in any degree, they should be subjected to a special investigation, just as much as the appointees now being considered by the Senate should be. I do not understand why there is this sudden demand for investigation by the FBI, and why that demand is directed at Mr. Lillenthal as if he were potentially the greatest traitor the country could ever have, when, so far as the committee could find, not a vestige of disloyalty was indicated by the testimony which came before the committee.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator agree with me that, in view of the fact that the Senate of the United States and its Members have to pass on Mr. Lillenthal and all major appointments, it might be a good plan to have the FBI investigate the Senate of the United States first—each individual Senator?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; and while they are investigating, should we not have the FBI investigate the President of the United States, who makes such appointments?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only difference is that both the President and the Senate of the United States are elected by the people and the others are appointees coming up for confirmation. However, the danger to the Nation of a disloyal person might be as great in one instance as in the other.

Mr. AIKEN. No elected official has a right to appoint disloyal persons to positions of such great importance.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. This discussion about the FBI and the investigation of officials, more or less political in nature, raises in my mind a most serious question. No person has a higher regard for the FBI, in the discharge of its proper functions, than I have. But I wish to point out to Senators that the FBI is a police organization. It is more or less in the nature of a secret police organization, and I wonder if Senators are standing on the floor of the Senate advocating that the time has come when the Senate of the United States, in the exercise of its constitutional functions, has to have reports from a police agency. I think there is grave danger in what is being suggested here today.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. As I understand the Senator from California, the bill which he has introduced this morning would require the same investigation of those who may be appointed in the future to the Atomic Energy Commission as my motion of last Friday would require of those who have already been appointed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The fact is, as I pointed out in my remarks, that since October the present members of the Commission have been serving as members of the Commission, and since December 31 the present members of the Commission have been de facto the Commission, with all the power, all the responsibilities, all the control over the Manhattan project, with all its secrets and all its ramifications. So that they have all the knowledge which General Groves and his assistants had, and no action which the Senate could take in rejecting these nominations could change that fact in the slightest. However, I believe there is legitimate criticism as to a loophole in the law, and the bill introduced by me would require in the future, prior to the time the President makes the appointments, a complete investigation by the FBI of any Presidential appointee, as is now required in the case of employees of the Commission, and a complete report would have to be furnished to the Senate section of the joint committee.

Mr. BRICKER. Is there any inference in the statement of the Senator that those who have been appointed already and who know the secrets, although the Senate has not passed on their nominations, would in any way reveal those secrets?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I do not believe any of these men would, and if I had thought for a moment that any of the members of the Commission, who had been appointed by the President of the United States, or the General Manager, was in the least degree disloyal to this Nation, or was a Communist, or a Communist sympathizer to the least extent, I would have voted against him in the committee, and I would be making a fight against him on the floor of the Senate. I do not believe they are anything but loyal American citizens, and that is why I am going to vote for their confirmation.

Mr. BRICKER. If there is any doubt in the mind of anyone that these men would get into any of the classifications the Senator has described, certainly they were not the men to be appointed in the first instance. Is not that true?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I assume that the President would not have appointed them had there been such a doubt.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to make one more suggestion. I am advised that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] asked two or three questions of the Senator from California in regard to whether or not there had been an investigation by the full committee. These records did not come to the committee until the day before the final meeting, and it was then in executive session. It was at that time that I asked that there be a complete hearing on all the appointees, that counsel be employed to make the investigation, and that there be brought to the attention of

the Senate all the details of the investigation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I point out to the Senate, as I did on Friday, that my distinguished colleague from Ohio was a regular attendant at the meetings, and was very sincere in his belief, just as the other eight of the nine members are very sincere in their belief, that the information which has been brought to the Senate to date is not information additional to what the committee had before it. The Senator is correct in saying that that information did not come in public hearings, but by the very nature of the Atomic Energy Act, and the very nature of the joint committee, and the Senate section of the committee which has been set up, there have been in the past times when we had to hold executive sessions and there will in the future be many more times when we will have to do so. The Senator is correct that this matter came up in executive session. My point was that information had been brought to the attention of the Senate section of the joint committee relative to the names of four or five persons.

Mr. BRICKER. It was my motion before the committee that a complete investigation be made.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], has pointed out that at the request of the Senator from Ohio the executive director of the committee went through the records we had, and did make the analysis or résumé to which the Senator from Ohio has referred.

Mr. BRICKER. That is the analysis or synopsis I filed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I propounded a question when the Senator from Ohio, I think, was out of the Chamber. My question was whether he was basing his motion, which is before us, on the fact that some newly discovered evidence had come in which the committee had not discovered.

Mr. BRICKER. It is information which in my judgment should be brought to the attention of the Senate before confirmation is had.

Mr. SMITH. It had been brought before the committee?

Mr. BRICKER. Oh, yes.

Mr. SMITH. When the committee voted they knew it was there. That is my point.

Mr. BRICKER. Substantially the same information. There was one further question, I think, asked by the Senator from New Jersey, that is, whether the President had cleared these appointments. There was no investigation made by the FBI and there was no request made by the President for an investigation by the FBI.

Mr. WILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator says all this evidence was before the Committee on Atomic Energy?

Mr. BRICKER. A report was made. I do not think any member of the com-

mittee read the report. I do not know that they did. They might have. There was a report substantially along the lines I brought to the attention of the Senate last Friday, made by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield, I can clear that up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator from Wisconsin yielded to me to ask a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to have the Senator permit me to make the answer, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Reports on the key employees of the Commission were requested upon the order or direction of the committee. As chairman of the committee, I was directed to request the reports. I did so. The reports came to my office. On two or three occasions, at least two that I know of, I took the entire files of the reports to the committee meeting. Each report was available for the complete and unhampered inspection of every member of the committee.

Mr. JENNER. Is that true also—

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me go a step further. The committee instructed me to have these reports examined by the executive director and by myself, that a résumé of any matters we felt might be submitted to the committee as matters in question should be made, that we should make that sort of a digest. That was done. The reports were always open and available to every member of the committee. The Senator from Ohio had some of them.

Mr. BRICKER. I had three of them, and I read three of them completely.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thought it was perhaps four, but, anyway, it was three. Any member of the committee had full access to them.

I may say to the Senator from Indiana that only in four or five instances were there matters which were not completely clear, matters which as chairman I thought it my duty to call to the attention of the committee for whatever judgment they wanted to pass upon them, and with the files available for a detailed examination of these reports by the members of the committee.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILEY. I yield for the purpose of a question.

Mr. JENNER. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether or not the committee also had the information that was produced on the floor last Friday by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Delaware appeared before our committee in executive session. I thought I explained that last Friday. The Senator from Delaware appeared before our committee and had information with

regard to two or three cooperative corporations. As it was clearly pointed out by him last Friday, and agreed to by those who were there, he did not at that time have so complete and detailed information as he presented last Friday on certain matters, and it was generally agreed that at that time it was not such a matter as created any particular furor. We asked Mr. Lillenthal to give an explanation, and that was given. That explanation was turned over to the Senator from Delaware, and is a part of the executive meeting records.

Mr. JENNER. As I understand, Mr. Lillenthal in his duties as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission is supposed to devote all his time to the Commission, and is to have no other outside interests. Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have not read the law on that point. I will take the Senator's word about it.

Mr. JENNER. I think the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] referred to it. Is not that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator referring to the TVA?

Mr. JENNER. No; I am referring to his present position.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I recall, the law requires him to give his full time to the duties of the office.

Mr. JENNER. Then has anyone on the committee investigated whether or not Mr. Lillenthal has given up his activities with the various corporations, in the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, Mr. President; it has been very clearly established, that, I think in 1936, Mr. Lillenthal gave up his activities with such corporations. The Senator from Delaware could give us more information on that, but we cleared that up.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I cannot yield interminably, because I owe an obligation to the House to have a conference report acted on by the Senate. If it be agreeable to the Senators, I suggest that I be permitted to proceed, and that when I have concluded with this matter, they may then continue their discussion.

TERMINATION OF WAR POWERS AND CONTROLS UNDER SECOND WAR POWERS ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act.

(See conference report printed in full when submitted by Mr. WILEY, on March 28, 1947, p. 2828, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the conferees met and worked all Saturday afternoon, and agreed to their report, about

6 o'clock. What we agreed upon is set forth, I think, quite succinctly in section 1501, of the conference report, which I shall take the liberty of reading:

SEC. 1501. Except as otherwise provided by statute enacted during the first session of the Eightieth Congress on or before the date this section as amended takes effect, titles I, II, III, IV, V, VII, and XIV of this act and the amendments to existing law made by such titles shall remain in force only until March 31, 1947, except that such title III, and the amendments to existing law made by such title, shall remain in force until June 30, 1947, for the following purposes—

This is the important part of it—

(a) Allocations of cinchona bark and cinchona alkaloids, manila (abaca) fiber and cordage, agave fiber and cordage, tin and tin products, antimony and streptomycin; (b) allocations limited to control of production for export of tractors; (c) allocations of the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carriers; (d) allocations of materials or facilities for export which are required to expand the production in foreign countries of materials critically needed in the United States; (e) allocations of materials or facilities which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us what the materials or facilities are that will be covered under paragraph (a) and upon which international commitments have been made?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall have to read in connection with (e) the subsequent language, and then I will come back to the question and try to answer it:

Provided, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III.

I take it that what the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana wishes to know is, what is going to happen to rice, meat and meat products, fats and oils, grain and grain products, which are not mentioned in the language of the bill that I have quoted.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. There is no way of telling by reading section (e).

Mr. WILEY. Let us go back to the subdivision (e) and see if we cannot understand just what that means:

Allocations of materials or facilities which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments.

It must be realized, first, that what happened on this was that the House accepted our version, that controls should continue until the 30th of June. Under their bill it was continued into October, so they accepted our philosophy in that respect.

Mr. ELLENDER. But in the House bill most of these articles were excepted, particularly rice, that the Senator has just mentioned, and that are now included under (e) by way of commitments?

Mr. WILEY. I will have to answer one question before I proceed to argue another. If it is understood that the conferees agreed first that all those controls

that are not mentioned should be lifted as of March 31, which is today, those that are mentioned extend until the 30th of June, only; so we come down to the Senator's question of what controls are mentioned. In order to reach that conclusion we had to realize that this Government has, in the international food arrangement, certain commitments or understandings relative to the feeding of the world, but it is also necessary to understand that we, of the Senate and of the House, have not been fully advised by the executive branch of the Government in regard to this matter, though for months we have been trying to obtain information, and the information we received came to us only after the 14th of March; so all the conferees agreed that it was advisable to extend the period of necessary control until the 30th of June.

Now what are these controls? First, let us consider rice. The rice control is only a set-aside order transferring it for Government use.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the Senator's view that whatever set-aside order has already been made in regard to rice will cover all commitments made for the future? In other words, will the Government be able to obtain a greater amount of rice or other grains or commodities to ship abroad than have already been set aside by way of commitments already made?

Mr. WILEY. I would say that the meaning of paragraph (e) is that if the Secretaries of State and Commerce both certify that between now and June 30 it is imperatively necessary to set aside additional amounts in order to meet our foreign commitments, even the set-aside order which has been in effect in the past would not limit the power of Government to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that the Senator interprets the language to relate to additional commitments as well as to commitments already made? I believe the Senator is in error or he may misunderstand what I am driving at.

Mr. WILEY. We have not interfered with the power which now exists in Government to meet an emergency that might arise between now and the 30th of June. I know what the Senator has in mind. During the period the set-aside order was in existence sometimes the Government set aside 50 percent, sometimes 60 percent, and sometimes 30 percent of the rice production.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the case of rice there has been as much as 40 percent set aside and—

Mr. WILEY. There has been as much as 70 percent set aside.

Mr. ELLENDER. The greatest percentage has escaped my mind at the moment. The world production of rice is now within 4 percent of the average produced from the 1935-36 season to the 1939-40 season. The rice crop in the United States for 1946 is officially estimated at 70,000,000 bushels, which is 40 percent larger than the 1937-41 average, and approximately 57½ percent

larger than the average of the 10 pre-war years.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. And the amount of rice produced in the United States is less than 1 percent of the world's normal production, and is twice as much as is consumed in the United States. For that reason I feel that rice should be taken entirely from all controls. Our production makes such a small dent on world consumption that our rice producers and millers should be left to expand their own markets here in this country and abroad, particularly to its traditionally good customers such as Cuba and Puerto Rico.

Mr. WILEY. I can say to the distinguished Senator that other Members of Congress felt the same way, but after all we have to have a basis on which minds in both the House and the Senate could meet, and it was finally agreed to have controls under title 3 of the Second War Powers Act and the Export Control Act expire on the same date. Recognizing the fact that neither the House nor the Senate, because of the Executive failure to give us full information, had the information that was necessary, we had to provide a stopgap.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Wisconsin know the reason for taking the determination of controls away from the Department of Agriculture and placing them in the Departments of State and Commerce. I understand this is a House proviso. The Department of Agriculture, as I understand, has been the agency of the Government of the United States which has represented us on the Food and Agricultural Organization and also on the International Food Council. I was wondering why the right to make these determinations was lodged with the State and Commerce Departments rather than with the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. WILEY. Let me say again that rice, about which we have been speaking, is included in the International Emergency Food Council agreement, and my recollection of what was stated in the conference is that none of the controls we have in mind was exercised by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. So far as that goes, the Department of Agriculture advises me that they intend to take controls off rice within a very short time anyway.

Mr. WILEY. Then, that answers this part of the report that has been brought into question.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the control of rice was continued by the Senate bill for 90 days.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that, Mr. President, but my question had to do with—

Mr. TAFT. It was also continued by the House bill for 90 days. Therefore the conference could do nothing about it.

Mr. ELLENDER. No, no, Mr. President, when we agreed in haste to the Senate bill I was aware of the fact that

the House had stricken out rice as well as wheat and other grains, and I did not desire to raise the issue on the floor and thereby precipitate debate, but hoping that the conferees could get together and agree to strike out rice and grain and other commodities from the Senate bill.

Mr. TAFT. The House may have stricken those particular grains, but the House bill contained the provision:

(e) Allocation of materials or equipment for export which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce are necessary to meet international commitments.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand that language applies to commitments already made. It would not mean the increase of commitments already made, would it?

Mr. TAFT. No; that language expressly provides that if the commodities were not already allocated on March 24, 1947, no allocation could be made. I think there is no question about that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to again ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin a question similar to that I propounded to him, last Friday, when the Senate bill was up for consideration: The compromise does not in any wise deal with price control, but it simply attempts to provide that the allocation and rationing authority as to certain named articles and the commitment of materials and facilities already made shall expire at the same time—that is, on June 30—as price controls? Is that not a correct summary of what will be done should the report be adopted?

Mr. WILEY. The reason the House agreed to that provision was, I think, they saw the logic of making the date June 30, because the so-called export controls under the Export Act expire at that time unless we extend them, and we felt in evaluating the whole picture that the only way to do was to bring them both to a joint expiration date, and then we could determine between now and then those controls that could safely be allowed to expire and those that should be continued.

Mr. ELLENDER. And what I previously indicated is, to a large extent, what the compromise provides?

Mr. WILEY. That is what the bill does.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know the reason why the House bill transferred these controls from the Department of Agriculture to the Departments of Commerce and State? I do not really think it makes any difference in the exercise of the controls, but it would be interesting to know why it was done.

Mr. WILEY. My recollection of what was stated in the conference is that in relation to the International Emergency Food Council agreement the Departments of Commerce and State really had the matters in charge.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The reason those words are found in the bill is that they were

in the bill sent to the House by the President. He wrote those words in the bill, and the House never changed them. The provision does not transfer the control to the Departments of State and Commerce. It merely permits the Departments of State and Commerce to certify the fact that certain commodities are connected with international commitments. After that the Department of Agriculture continues controlling just as in the past.

Mr. AIKEN. The provision really transfers the determination of the matter, however.

Mr. TAFT. The determination of whether certain items are included in the provisions of the bill or not.

Mr. AIKEN. Then I understand we have to look to the President for an answer to that question.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I was going to ask the Senator in charge of the conference report if the remarks made during the colloquy between the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Louisiana pertaining to rice are not also applicable in exactly the same way to grain and grain products, and the milling of grain and grain products.

Mr. WILEY. That raises a somewhat different question. The present control in relation to grain and grain products under this particular act is an importation control, but I feel—

Mr. BUTLER. Importation or exportation control?

Mr. WILEY. No; importation control. It happens to be War Food Order 63. On the other hand, I do not think there need be any fear that between now and June 30 the Government is going to alter the picture by extending its controls in that direction. However, I want to be frank about the matter. There was no intention between now and June 30 to limit the Government in fulfilling its obligations under the International Emergency Food Council agreement.

Mr. BUTLER. That would refer to exports.

Mr. WILEY. Yes; that would come under the Export Act, anyway.

Mr. BUTLER. In that connection subdivision (e) and, in fact, the entire section, refers to the power of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce in making certain certifications. I assume they certify to the President. To whom do they certify?

Mr. WILEY. To the President. This is really a limitation in relation to all future controls, some of which I have mentioned, including those on rice, Cheddar cheese, meats, fats, beans, peas, proteins, grain, and grain products.

Mr. BUTLER. That limitation is to meet international commitments already made, is it not?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. Not international commitments that may be made hereafter. As I understand, it does not refer to new international commitments, but to commitments which are now on the books.

Mr. WILEY. I do not believe that that exact question arose. I presume

that what we had in mind was that between now and June 30, in this world of crises and troubles, the power was still lodged in the President to do that which he thought was necessary to meet international commitments. Or let us put it this way—to meet commitments in the International Emergency Food Council agreements.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I dislike reopening the question, but the purpose is simply and solely to carry out commitments already made. The provision is not to apply to additional future commitments.

Mr. BUTLER. That was my impression, and I wanted that fact brought out.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my understanding; and I am sure that is the understanding of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. During the past—I believe under the War Powers Act—certain controls over the milling industry have been in effect. The industry was required to grind a certain percentage of the wheat into flour. Instead of grinding 60 percent flour it had to make 70 or 80 percent flour from wheat. Is that power extended under this measure, or is it dropped?

Mr. WILEY. Has the Senator in mind any particular control? The Senator was talking about grain and grain products.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. We asked the President to submit to us—which he did—a list of the controls still in existence under title III. The only order I find anywhere in relation to grain and grain products is War Food Order 63, which is an importation control. That is all the authority that was exercised under title III of the Second War Powers Act. That is all the authority that is now being exercised. Of course there is no intent by this conference report to interfere with any other laws under which the President may exercise certain authority.

Mr. BUTLER. If I correctly understand the chairman of the committee, this provision applies only to commitments which have already been made.

Mr. WILEY. This is the language:

Provided, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III.

Counsel for the committee has stated that the language of the bill limits the commodities in all respects to such as were under allocation on March 24, 1947.

Mr. BUTLER. Then, as I understand, it is the Senator's opinion that it does not affect the grinding order. The Senator knows what 50 percent flour, 60 percent flour, and 80 percent extraction mean. I am anxious to know if under this provision the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce could require that the extraction orders which were issued to the mills shall not be renewed.

Mr. WILEY. I do not think I can answer that question, because the subject is not covered in the bill one way or the other. What we are trying to do is to maintain the status quo of existing orders, with the possible exception, under subclause (e), of "materials or facilities which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments." The Government is not limited except as stated in the proviso:

Provided, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III.

A further proviso is:

That nothing herein contained shall be construed to continue beyond March 31, 1947, any authority to allocate sugar, rubber, or the derivatives thereof.

The first proviso, as I have already stated, is:

Provided, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III.

That is a limitation with respect to title III. But there may be other authority; and I believe that subclause (e) does not limit the President if a certificate is forthcoming from the Secretaries of State and Commerce.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I must insist that, as I understand the language, under subclause (e) it refers to commitments already made, and does not apply to any future commitments. The language as to March 24, to which the Senator refers, names the articles which were then under allocation requirements.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I again repeat, subclause (e) refers simply to the fulfillment of promises by way of commitments, made by the Government in the past. It is limited to that. It cannot mean anything else. Will the Senator read the language again, and tell us, as chairman of the committee, if he does not agree with us?

Mr. WILEY. I think I have covered the subject three or four times, and given my understanding of the meaning of "e."

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has not answered the question specifically.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. My opinion is that the word "commitments" refers to something to which we are now committed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. That is my position.

Mr. TAFT. That is what it must mean. Otherwise we would say "contracts hereafter made, undertaken, or entered into." It seems to me that when we talk about commitments in a temporary bill we mean the things to which we are already committed.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my understanding; and that view is what I was trying to elicit from the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, it is my intention to vote for the conference report to extend the Second War Powers Act, because I believe that certain commodities such as tin and fibers and other strategic materials are in scarce supply. For that reason I voted to extend sugar controls until October 31, 1947.

I repeat, Mr. President, that I desire to make it known, however, that rice which is not mentioned in the extension of the Second War Powers Act, remains under controls only by way of commitments already made, by reason of subparagraph (e) which we fully discussed in the course of this debate. I do not desire to take exception to this portion of the conference report since I am not in a position to know what these international commitments have been and how binding they are; but I want it distinctly understood that in voting for this report I do so, insofar as rice is concerned, because of the definite information which I have secured this day from the Department of Agriculture to the effect that an order, which has already been signed, is being circulated to the effect that all producers and millers who have already complied with their commitments will not be required to set aside any more rice from the present crop, and that in the future no further set-aside will be required of them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. CAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Connally	Green
Ball	Cooper	Gurney
Barkley	Cordon	Hatch
Bricker	Donnell	Hawkes
Brooks	Downey	Hayden
Buck	Dworshak	Hickenlooper
Bushfield	Eaton	Hill
Butler	Ellender	Hoey
Byrd	Ferguson	Holland
Cain	Flanders	Ives
Capper	Fulbright	Jenner
Chavez	George	Johnson, Colo.

Johnston, S. C.	Millikin	Stewart
Kem	Moore	Taft
Kilgore	Morse	Taylor
Knowland	Murray	Thomas, Okla.
Langer	Myers	Thomas, Utah
Lodge	O'Connor	Tobey
Lucas	O'Daniel	Tydings
McCarran	O'Mahoney	Umstead
McCarthy	Overton	Vandenberg
McClellan	Pepper	Watkins
McFarland	Reed	Wherry
McGrath	Revercomb	White
McKellar	Robertson, Va.	Willey
McMahon	Robertson, Wyo.	Williams
Magnuson	Russell	Wilson
Malone	Saltonstall	Young
Martin	Smith	
Maybank	Sparkman	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I beg the indulgence of the Senate so that I may say without interruption what I have in mind to say in the next 20 minutes about the proposed Lillienthal appointment. At the conclusion I shall gladly attempt to answer any questions which Senators on either side of the aisle may care to ask me.

Several weeks ago the President of the United States sent to the Senate the nomination of George Catlett Marshall to become the Secretary of State. A very few minutes later every Senator present, on both sides of the aisle, had voted for the nominee. It is, therefore, worth while, particularly today as we consider another Presidential nomination, to reflect on the qualities which made Mr. Marshall so conclusively and rapidly acceptable to the Senate.

I think the Senate felt as America did about Mr. Marshall; namely, that there was nothing about his character, integrity, purpose, courage, ability, or Americanism which was open to a shadow or a glimmer of a doubt. We shared with America the feeling that Mr. Marshall, as Secretary of State, would be neither too tough nor too soft in his dealings with Russia and the other nations of the world. We thought he would do the right thing for and with everybody. We had no reason to second-guess one whom we felt with conviction was completely disinterested and unselfish. We had no cause to feel that the nomination was political in any degree. The Senate considered Mr. Marshall to be, to the extent that a mortal man can be without weakness, the perfect choice. Both Democrats and Republicans applauded the President's wisdom in recommending General Marshall.

Mr. President, now the Senate is considering another Presidential nomination, that of Mr. David E. Lillienthal, to

become Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. In his nomination we have a classic contrast to the example I have just referred to. Rightly or wrongly, we are confronted by a nomination which many Senators will never vote to confirm.

Who and what is Mr. David E. Lillienthal? I am certain that I do not know, for the record is so contradictory. By some he has been called a Communist, by others a Socialist, a collectivist, an opportunist, a prophet of the world to be, a New Dealer, a great administrator, a great American, and simply a genius.

My own opinion, and a very positive one, is that he is neither a Communist nor a Socialist, although if a man can be judged by the company which supports and applauds his conduct he could too easily be held suspect on these counts. When Mr. Lillienthal denies any knowledge that the Southern Conference of Human Welfare, for which he was a sponsor, possessed a communistic tinge, I do not think him guilty of having some connection with the Communist Party, but I do think him politically innocent and naive. If he did not know that Earl Browder had testified before a committee of the Congress that the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was a party transmission belt, he should have made it his business to know it.

What Mr. Lillienthal is, outside of not being a Communist or Socialist, all of us are trying to find out. In a 1944 volume of current biography there is the following description of the man which appears to have been approved by Mr. Lillienthal:

Mr. Lillienthal is a good speaker who understands modern publicity and its value; a thoroughgoing realist, he is not very sensitive to personal criticism. He likes to refer to himself as an amateur athlete, an amateur author, and an amateur administrator. Although his salary is \$10,000 a year, he is particularly insistent on the last mentioned designation. One of the very few agency heads named in the early days of the New Deal who is still in the same post, he says that he always keeps his suitcase packed. "I'm not keen about a career in public service. It gives some people a desire for security that weakens their ability to stand up to things."

The only two things of interest to me in this 1944 description are the references to "amateur administrator" and the expressed desire to return to private life. I shall refer to both in a few minutes.

But now, Mr. President, I want to talk out loud to myself and to any who care to reflect and listen, about my respect for and understanding of the potential and promise of atomic energy and the requirements demanded of the individual to be chosen Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. We all grant that the Secretary of State has a tremendous responsibility and that he must be, as he currently is, outstanding in every respect. Important, however, as is the Secretary of State's assignment, it may well turn out to be insignificant when compared to the task assigned to the Atomic Energy Commission Chairman.

On November 17, 1946, Mr. R. L. Duffers, of the New York Times, described the issue before us all. He wrote:

The world's greatest problem today is the control of atomic energy. America's share

of that problem lies in the hands of five men who sit in temporary offices in Washington and compose the United States Atomic Energy Commission—AEC for short. These men have vast power. They recognize that a revolution in human affairs came about when the atom was split and the basis forces of the universe were released. What they do is certain to affect, not only the future of America, but of all nations—of mankind at large. They are not authorized to lay down rules for other nations, but to frame our policy on atomic energy, and our domestic policy may be decisive.

The AEC is not just another regulatory body. It takes over a tremendous physical plant—Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Hanford, Wash.; Los Alamos, N. Mex.—names associated with the production of the atomic bomb—and many laboratories; it also takes over our supplies of fissionable material. It holds, moreover, the world's most portentous secret. It has been entrusted by Congress with nothing less than the supervision of an economic, social, and technological revolution. Nothing like this has ever happened before in history. The AEC is unique. Its ultimate mandate is found in the preamble of the Atomic Energy Act—

Mr. President, all of us should think about that constantly. Mr. Duffers then quotes from that act, as follows:

It is reasonable to anticipate that tapping this new source of energy will cause profound changes in our present way of life. Accordingly it is hereby declared to be the policy of the people of the United States that, subject at all times to the paramount objective of assuring the common defense and security, the development and utilization of atomic energy shall, so far as practicable, be directed toward improving the public welfare, increasing the standard of living, strengthening free competition in private enterprise and promoting world peace.

Thus the AEC is first, a business—the most stupendous business in the world; second, it is by all odds the most important single unit in the national defense; third, it is a great research agency; fourth, it is an educational institution; paradoxically instructed not to exchange information with other nations but nevertheless to provide that free interchange of ideas and criticisms which is essential to scientific progress; fifth, it is a welfare agency, of dimensions never before conceived outside of a Utopian's dream.

The man who will guide the fortunes of the AEC is David E. Lillienthal, former chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. President, there we have a statement of the scope of the terrifying job and a reference to the man who has been recommended to design our destiny.

Is Mr. Lillienthal the right man for that job? If he is, no single vote should be cast against him. If he is not, no set of pressures, however strong, should be permitted to secure the confirmation of his nomination. There must be no doubt or question about his fitness, purposes, or motives.

I have followed the public Lillienthal hearings, not in person, for time would not permit that, but as closely as I could through reading the transcripts. I was completely fascinated and absorbed by what I read. I was led to believe that there was a struggle—not a struggle by a Senate committee in its search to determine if Mr. Lillienthal was the best of all possible persons for the atomic post, but a struggle between the nominee and a senior Senator who was not a member of

the committee. The further I read, the more I became convinced that the committee was sitting more in judgment on the Senator than on the nominee. I do not know when or why the long enduring quarrel between the two men began, and it is none of my business. That they had no respect for each other was obvious. That some of what passed between them had nothing to do with the question at issue was just as clear. But, to my mind, the committee spent too much of its precious time deciding that the nominee was being persecuted by the Senator. If anyone thinks me wrong, I can but urge that he study the transcript.

To my mind the Senator had a right to speak as he saw fit, regardless of what his motives might have been; but the committee had little cause to be influenced by his accusations, charges, and attack if the committee considered them to be valueless or irrelevant. From my point of view, it was the committee's task to return again and again to the single, only question, "Is the nominee the one man, above all question, for the appointment?"

The committee heard the nominee constantly referred to as a great administrator. This fact, if it is a fact, materially influenced the decision in his favor. But what steps did the committee take to determine Mr. Lillenthal's excellence as an administrator? Did it call as witnesses those Congressmen, admittedly serious critics of the nominee, before whom Mr. Lillenthal had often appeared in the past? Did it examine Mr. Lillenthal's philosophy toward government and economics through his written works? Did it evidence any curiosity about an article in the Harvard Law Review of February 1941 in which Lillenthal argues for public corporations operating for profit and free of congressional control over income and expenditures and personnel? Did the committee bother to investigate the 20 serious charges made against Mr. Lillenthal and the Tennessee Valley Authority by the Congressmen and Senator, all of whom are presently available, whose views represent the minority portion of the congressional joint committee report resulting from an investigation of the TVA which was authorized by the Seventy-sixth Congress? No, Mr. President; none of these reasonable and logical steps were taken. Instead, the committee heard a number of witnesses who could only say that Mr. Lillenthal had spent unheard-of sums of Government money, and that, therefore, he must stand forth as an acknowledged, great administrator. Until the criticisms included in the joint congressional committee report are fully answered, I, for one, shall refuse to recognize any greatness about Lillenthal's public-administrative ability; and if there is room for doubt over what he has accomplished in the past, there is small reason to believe that he is properly or fully equipped to fill the post he seeks at this time. His record is that of a man whose thirst for power and authority is unquenchable. To confirm him would be to give him power beyond his ability to absorb or control.

I would gather from the opinion held by some Senators, and by many Americans, that Mr. Lillenthal is an indispensable man. It is said by these advocates that the Commission will fail utterly unless the nominee is appointed and encouraged to proceed. I know of no single reason which gives substance to this contention.

That Mr. Lillenthal is an able man in many ways appears to be beyond question. That he has any valid claim to greatness, I strongly doubt. That the Commission must either have him as its Chairman, or suffer dire consequences, is an unwarranted assumption.

To say that Mr. Lillenthal is indispensable is to assume that his knowledge of atomic energy, its origin, uses, and problems is limitless. I dare say many persons in America take Mr. Lillenthal to be the foremost atomic-energy authority in the world. But he was not when he was nominated, and I do not think he is now.

How many Americans know that Mr. Lillenthal was not the President's first choice? Or his second or third choice for the post? I do not know what numbered choice he was, but I very much doubt that he was even considered when the President initially became concerned over what ought to be done with atomic energy.

I know that the Special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy, which was established on October 29, 1945, less than 18 short months ago, to make a full, complete, and continuing study and investigation with respect to problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy, had never heard of Mr. Lillenthal in connection with atomic energy, and they did not know anything about him 4 or 5 months later. This committee held hearings over a period of many weeks, in which every phase of atomic-energy legislation was discussed. The committee heard from more than 70 witnesses. Included among them were industrialists and engineers; Cabinet members and qualified Government officials; War and Navy Department leaders; scientists and lay persons, both men and women. But Mr. Lillenthal was not a witness at the hearings, the reason being, I suppose, that he had little to offer. Yet people by the thousands in this land will be surprised to hear that Mr. Lillenthal was not among those who struggled so hard and long to produce the Commission whose head the Senate ponders over now.

It is my personal opinion, but one which is shared by many, that the President, had he delayed his selection of Mr. Lillenthal for as much as 2 weeks, would never again have considered the name of David Lillenthal for the post of Atomic Energy Chairman. Not that the President would not have continued to hold his TVA Chairman in high regard; not that he would have thought Mr. Lillenthal to be less talented and/or able, but he would have known in November what he did not quite understand in October—that America once more wanted to place its faith and confidence in men, either Democrats or Republicans, who understand that the authoritarian philosophy and concept and ultimate reactionary procedures of the new order—

call it New Deal, if you will—had been sincerely and vigorously tried and found wanting.

It is not being unreasonable to say that the Lillenthal appointment was largely political in character.

Interestingly enough, it was announced at the height of the pre-election excitement. It gave promise of holding in line the radical fringe, the left wing, and the tread softly with Russia advocates. Up until the last few days much of my Lillenthal mail has been in favor of his confirmation, and 85 per cent of it has expressed the fear that Russia would somehow suffer an affront were Lillenthal to suffer defeat in the Senate. One wonders how these supporters reacted to the President's recent speech about the threat of communism abroad.

I know of no friend or foe of Mr. Lillenthal who does not consider him to be a leading pleader and apostle of the New Deal. By way of example, I refer the Senate to an interview Doris Fleeceon, of the Washington Star, recently had with Mr. Robert Hannegan, Postmaster General. With respect to New Dealers, Mr. Hannegan said that those who had stayed on the reservation were getting the same consideration they always did. Illustratively, he cited Mr. Truman's appointment of David Lillenthal to the Atomic Energy Commission.

The President would not intentionally nominate an individual for any post if he thought his nominee would promptly become a controversial figure, and particularly he would not want to encounter trouble with his Atomic Energy Chairman selection, in whom there must be almost national faith and confidence if the latter's efforts are to be understood, supported, and approved. Obviously the President did not judge the temper of many people when he thought of Mr. Lillenthal.

In knowing now what he did not know before, the President cannot expect any measure of full support from those on both sides of the aisle who are in lasting opposition to bureaucratic paternalism, nor from those Senators who have so recently come from extended, thoughtful, difficult, and even bitter campaigns which were basically waged against what they conceived the big Government radicalism of the New Deal to be.

The President could not, on reflection, ask us to support his present choice. We trust that, on further reflection, he will not ask us to embarrass him more, for none of us have any such desire or intention in mind. We merely and sincerely hope to eventually vote unanimously for an individual, any individual, who has the complete confidence of this body and the Nation.

Is it not fair to raise the question publicly; why does not Mr. Lillenthal step aside? It is said by some, though I do not believe it, that he resisted the proposed Presidential appointment. He so testified in the recent extended hearings. As a public servant, his only interest can be the best interests of our country. If he is not wanted by a segment of the people, I should think he would bow out in favor of another.

He knows, as well as any man alive, how imperatively important and necessary public and official confidence will

be to his job. He knows now that, without fear of contradiction, and for reasons which may even be unfair to him as a person, he will never benefit from the public faith his task would demand.

He knows, too, for I am trying to make it clear, that a majority of those who have just come to the Senate from every grass-root region in the land are positive and firm in our opposition to his proposed appointment.

If Mr. Lillenthal steps aside, or is defeated, it will not mark the first time this has happened. Presidential nominees by the score, through the years, have failed to be confirmed by the Senate. Between the terms of George Washington and Franklin Roosevelt more than 150 major executive nominations have been rejected by the United States Senate. Six of George Washington's nominations were turned down, and 11 of Thomas Jefferson's proposed appointments were rejected. A number of able and good men must have been among the many who were rejected, but it is safe to feel that in a majority of the cases the recommended individual was not the right man for the job he sought.

Alexander Hamilton, writing in the *Federalist*, said, "It will be the office of the President to nominate, and with the advice and consent of the Senate to appoint." Gouverneur Morris thought this arrangement would assure responsibility through nomination by the President and security through the Senate's concurrence.

It is proper, therefore, that we think in terms of advice to the President regarding his present nominee. My advice, at least, is that his nominee is unacceptable because of a score of reasons laid before the Senate, and that he, the President, should withdraw the name of David E. Lillenthal and submit another.

This advice is not given lightly or disrespectfully, because one does not differ with the President except for solid and sound cause. That our willingness to differ with a Presidential wish must seem strange and unexplainable to some goes without saying. To them I can only point out that the day of rubber-stamp confirmations and rubber-stamp Congresses is over and done with. It should not any longer be expected that we should agree with what we do not agree with. The sooner this fact is taken for granted the sooner the legislative and executive branches of the Government will harmonize their efforts for the ultimate good of all citizens.

Does a single Member of the Senate have any right to assume that America is so lacking in and devoid of leadership that we must accept a controversial contradictory, cloudy figure as our selection to head the most powerful organization the mind of man has ever conceived? If we accept the premise that David Lillenthal, or any other individual, is, in spite of the serious doubts held by some of us, indispensable, we shall do the American Nation an irreparable injustice. If we confirm the nominee, as the Senate has the power to do, we are doing Mr. Lillenthal no favor. We leave the Nation confused and uncertain about the choice. We withhold from the Chairman what he needs most—a sympathetic, devoted,

understanding public. Unless the Chairman maintains this relationship with the people of this land, his efforts are foredoomed to suspicion, argument, and failure.

I would automatically vote against any man who sought to secure appointment to the Atomic Energy Commission. Of all appointments the one in question ought to seek the man. There is no qualified man alive who should feel that he was fully qualified. The very nature of the assignment would prevent any save the power seeker from feeling that he possessed what was required. But I feel, though I may be wrong, that Mr. Lillenthal took particular steps and pains to secure the nomination.

He became, almost overnight, a self-admitted authority on atomic energy. His public speeches on the subject sounded as though he was looking for the job which not long after came his way. As a member of the State Department's own atomic committee, Mr. Lillenthal handled the consultants who did the work resulting in what became known as the Lillenthal report, released on March 28, 1946. A chief contributor to this report appears to have been Herbert S. Marks, a former assistant to Mr. Lillenthal at TVA, and now general counsel for the Atomic Energy Commission. I suppose every Senator is thoroughly familiar with the basic and fundamental differences between this plan and the plan as it was drastically revised by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch. The Baruch proposals were violently opposed by Mr. Henry Wallace. We might just as well recall that the CIO Political Action Committee, the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, and the National Citizens Political Action Committee were among those who roared approval of the Wallace concept while raging against the realistically reasonable protective measures Mr. Baruch had in mind.

While the furor between Baruch and Wallace was absorbing public attention, the Atomic Energy Commission was being quietly put together. Mr. Baruch recommended several national figures to the President, but I understand they turned down their proposed appointments to the Commission. I think this action took place in September of last year.

In October of 1946 the Commission was announced by the President. It is my understanding that the announcement came as a complete and disappointing surprise to Mr. Baruch and to Secretary of State Byrnes, neither of whom had been consulted.

Mr. Lillenthal might have been surprised by the announcement of his appointment, for he has testified that he struggled against being the President's choice, but he was not caught napping. Within 24 hours of his appointment he publicly announced that the Atomic Energy Commission would take over the Army's atomic project. Immediately following this declaration he named a temporary staff which included Herbert S. Marks, and Carroll L. Wilson, both of whom had served on the original State Department board.

To my way of thinking, Mr. President, it needed no prodding to force Mr. Lillen-

thal to accept a post on the Commission. He is there by design and desire, and will remain where he is if he can. If this contention was not true he would have retired when his nomination first encountered serious opposition.

In recognizing the brilliant design of the finest propaganda campaign I have ever encountered I would reply only to that portion of it which comes from my own northwest section of America. The story is being told in that area that private power interests are making a many-pronged attack against the extension of public power and the Valley Authority principle, and that a smoke screen for the private-power attack is the present congressional resistance to the confirmation of Mr. Lillenthal. The only answer I have to this misrepresentation, Mr. President, is that it constitutes premeditated maliciousness on the part of those who are unwilling to admit that Mr. Lillenthal is something less than a saint, and who are unwilling to agree that any proposed further extension of the Valley Authority principle should be exposed to additional study, research, and analysis, leading to a determination based on fact, need, and conclusive proof. I come, Mr. President, from a public-power State. I believe in the development which comes from a wise and reasonable use of public power. But this does not mean that I or any other thinking person should automatically assume that Lillenthal, the TVA experimenter, is qualified to become Lillenthal, the atomic-energy experimenter, nor does it provide excuse to assume that if one questions Mr. Lillenthal's fitness for the atomic energy chairmanship he is trying to hamstring and sabotage the development of public power throughout America. The curse of public power today is in the activities of those who crusade without thinking, who trample the rights of others underfoot, who will use any means, legitimate or foul, to secure their end result. That very small but articulate minority in the Northwest which does not tell the truth in its assertions of bad faith and evil purposes on the part of those who oppose Mr. Lillenthal is an example of what I mean.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I am not unmindful of what the able chairman of the Senate Atomic Energy Committee said the other day about the imperative need for action in confirming the nomination of a chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I share his distress over the fact that so little has been accomplished since the decision was made to place the future of atomic energy in the hands of a civilian commission. I recognize that atomic energy will help to keep America secure for as long a time as our research leads the world. There is need for action and confirmation by this Senate, but it must be action and confirmation of a character that all of America will approve, respect, and support. Anything short of this will represent no lasting progress at all. We must be right in what we are doing now.

A great contest is sweeping this earth. It engages the energies and ambitions and abilities of those who strive mightily to make the universe either slave or free. All of us hope that freedom will survive.

None of us are yet satisfied that it will. The struggle to determine the final decision has just begun. Yet in the face of this political fact and reality there is an intention to turn to a political innocent for guidance and leadership in the unexplored field of atomic energy. We consider an individual who must count among his supporters nearly all of those who believe in a managed economy, an unrealistic and unreasonable softer attitude toward the Soviet Union, and the surrender of our national sovereignty to a world super state. That America wants to cooperate with the world is obvious. That America has no reason to surrender its right to live in the world of tomorrow is no less clear.

Whatever the excellence of this man's ability, sincerity, and good intentions, it is offset a thousand times by the encouragement and stimulus his appointment would give to a host of those who believe in a world of make-believe.

Every Senator in this Chamber speaks his own mind. I have spoken mine in trying to prove that Mr. Lilienthal is a casual and haphazard choice for the job he seeks. It is not that he suffers from either a lack of ability or good intentions. It is simply a case where the job in question demands more than he has to give. My respect for the land and world in which I live will never permit me to vote for a compromise, and Mr. David E. Lilienthal can be considered to be nothing more.

EXTENSION OF SUGAR CONTROLS— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House Joint Resolution 146, providing for the extension of sugar controls, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the conference report for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That (a) notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 23); the Stabilization Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 765); title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 177), and the amendment to existing law made thereby; title XIV of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 177); and section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), all as amended and extended, shall continue in effect with respect to sugar to and including October 31, 1947, except that authority to continue inventory controls over other than household users may be exercised to and including March 31, 1948: *Provided, however, That—*

"(1) the authority contained herein shall not be deemed (i) to permit the allocation or

rationing of any product (other than the allocation of such product imported or brought into the continental United States) unless a regulation providing for allocation or rationing thereof was in effect on February 18, 1947, or (ii) to permit price control over any product unless a price-control regulation with respect thereto was in effect on February 18, 1947;

"(2) no person shall be subject to any criminal penalty or civil liability, under any provision of law referred to above, on account of any act or omission which is made unlawful by section 4 of this Act;

"(3) no provision of section 204 (d) or (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall apply (i) in any proceeding, involving a regulation or order with respect to sugar, in which an injunction or other order of a court is hereafter applied for, or (ii) in any proceeding, under section 37 of the Criminal Code, which is based on a conspiracy involving any act or omission which is made unlawful by section 4 of this Act;

"(4) in the case of any regulation or order with respect to sugar, no protest may be hereafter filed under section 203 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; and

"(5) hereafter no person shall be required to secure a license, and no license shall be issued to any person, under section 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, for the purpose of providing for the enforcement of any regulation or order relating to sugar.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture, in exercising the powers, functions, and duties transferred to him by section 3 of this Act—

"(1) may allocate sugar without regard to the provisions of title II of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 757);

"(2) shall allocate refined sugar for home consumption at a rate of not less than thirty-five pounds per capita per calendar year, and any increase in the amount of sugar available for allocation in the calendar year 1947 over the amount recommended by the International Emergency Food Council for allocation to the United States for 1947 shall be allocated for home consumption until the allocation for such use equals fifty pounds of refined sugar per capita; and

"(3) shall, in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program, make available, for other than provisional-allotment users, not less than 12,500 tons of refined sugar during the period from the date of the enactment of this Act to and including June 30, 1947, and not less than 12,500 tons of refined sugar during the period from July 1, 1947, to and including October 31, 1947, to provide for the needs of hardship cases, for the needs of new industrial-sugar users (with particular reference to the needs of shortage areas caused by population shifts) and for the needs of those who have an insufficient base period history to operate currently at competitive levels (and shall consider, as a determining factor in those cases where there is such insufficient base period history, the rate of growth of such user prior to the base period year).

"Sec. 2. Prior to the expiration of the authority granted by this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to remove any or all controls with respect to any product over which control is authorized by this Act when he determines that the supplies of sugar are sufficient to warrant such action.

"Sec. 3. (a) The powers, functions, and duties of (1) the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment to existing law made thereby; (2) the President or any executive department under section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940; (3) the Price Administrator under the

Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; and (4) the President and the Price Administrator under the Stabilization Act of 1942, all as amended and extended (and irrespective of what officer, department, or agency may be now exercising any such power, function, or duty) are, insofar as they relate to sugar, hereby transferred to and shall be executed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(b) Every order, directive, rule or regulation, relating to any power, function, or duty transferred by subsection (a) of this section, issued by any officer, department, or agency heretofore performing such power, function, or duty, which is not in conflict with the provisions of this Act and which is in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall continue in full force and effect, according to its terms, unless and until modified or rescinded by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(c) So much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds, and the property, available for the use of any officer, department, or agency in the exercise of any power, function, or duty transferred by subsection (a) of this section or for the use of the Secretary of Agriculture in the exercise of any power, function, or duty so transferred, as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine, shall be transferred for use in connection with the exercise of such powers, functions, or duties. In determining the amount to be transferred, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds prior to the transfer. Such personnel as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines to be required may also be transferred temporarily to the Department of Agriculture pending termination of the powers, functions, and duties transferred by subsection (a) of this section. The annual and sick leave of personnel so transferred shall be transferred with them; and they shall be entitled to the benefits of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to the same extent and effect as though they had remained employees of the agency from which transferred until the termination of such powers, functions, and duties. Any personnel so transferred shall not, by virtue of their temporary employment in the Department of Agriculture, acquire or be entitled to any right to employment in such Department in connection with the exercise of any power, function, or duty other than one transferred under this Act. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to do or omit to do any act, in violation of any order, directive, rule, or regulation continued in effect by section 3 (b) of this Act or issued in the exercise of any power, function, or duty transferred by section 3 (a) of this Act.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the Government, or for any adviser or consultant to the Secretary of Agriculture in his official capacity, to disclose, otherwise than in the course of official duty, any information obtained under this Act, or to use any such information, for personal benefit.

"(c) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than two years in the case of a violation of subsection (b) and for not more than one year in all other cases, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

"Sec. 5. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or

legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing, and includes the United States or any agency thereof, or any other Government, or any of its political subdivisions, or any agency of any of the foregoing: *Provided*, That no punishment provided by this Act shall apply to the United States, or to any such government, political subdivision, or agency.

"(b) The term 'sugar' means any grade or type of saccharine product derived from sugarcane, sugar beets, or corn, including liquid sugar, sirups, molasses, or mixtures thereof, and sugar-containing products, which contain sucrose, dextrose, or levulose.

"Sec. 6. (a) Section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'Surplus Property Act of 1944,' the following: 'Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947.'"

"(b) This Act may be cited as the 'Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

CHAS. W. TOBEY,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the conferees met and finished their work on last Friday, and their report is now before the Senate. The House adopted it about an hour ago.

The substitute agreed to in conference—

First. Adopts the provisions of the joint resolution as passed by the House making the Emergency Court of Appeals, protest, and license procedures under sections 203, 204 (d) and (e), and 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 inapplicable to regulations with respect to sugar;

Second. Adopts the provisions of the joint resolution as passed by the House imposing criminal penalties, making such penalties exclusive, and eliminating civil liability such as that for triple damages.

Third. Adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment guaranteeing the housewife 35 pounds per year, and additional amounts in the event of increased supplies.

Fourth. Adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment with respect to new users in lieu of the provisions for such users in the joint resolution as passed by the House. The quantity to be made available to such users is reduced, however, to 25,000 tons (in view of the fact that controls are extended only to October 31, 1947), of which 12,500 tons is to be made available between the enactment of the joint resolution and June 30, 1947, and 12,500 tons is to be made available between July 1, 1947, and October 31, 1947. Included with new users are hardship cases and the allocation to these users is to be made as was provided in the joint resolution passed by the House "in a manner consistent with the

maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program."

Fifth. Adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment with respect to the rights of the personnel to be transferred to the Department of Agriculture in lieu of the provisions of the bill as passed by the House.

Sixth. Gives the act a short title, "Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947," and exempts it from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Seventh. Omits subsection (c) of the first section of the bill as passed by the House which would have exempted from the effect of the resolution the importation of products in consumer-size containers upon certification by the exporting country that such products had been produced out of domestic quota sugar; and

Eighth. Omits the savings clause, section 3 (d) of the Senate amendment, which was not considered necessary, there being nothing in the act which would be considered to terminate any criminal liability.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. OVERTON obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Myers
Ball	Hill	O'Connor
Barkley	Hoey	O'Daniel
Bricker	Holland	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Ives	Overton
Buck	Jenner	Pepper
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Byrd	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Cain	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Capper	Knowland	Russell
Chavez	Langer	Saltanstill
Connally	Lodge	Smith
Cooper	Lucas	Sparkman
Cordon	McCarran	Stewart
Donnell	McCarthy	Taft
Downey	McClellan	Taylor
Dworschak	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Eaton	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McKellar	Tobey
Ferguson	McMahon	Tydings
Flanders	Magnuson	Umstead
Fulbright	Malone	Vandenberg
George	Martin	Watkins
Green	Maybank	Wherry
Gurney	Millikin	Wiley
Hatch	Moore	Williams
Hawkes	Morse	Young
Hayden	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, most if not all of the material information appearing of record bearing upon the confirmation of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal has, in the course of approximately a week's debate, been presented on the floor of the Senate. It is not my intention, therefore, to discuss the evidence with respect to the advisability of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Lilienthal or of his comembers on the Atomic Energy Commission, or of its manager, except as testimony of record may bear on the issues on which I desire to express my views at this time.

I shall confine my remarks, for the most part, to the motion made on Friday, March 28, by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. This motion is to recommit the question of the confirmation of the Presidential appointees on the Atomic Energy Commission to the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for further study, investigation, and report.

Mr. President, we are not considering the confirmation of individuals for appointment to ordinary office. We are considering the proper men for the most important Commission ever created by any act of the Congress since the organization of our Government.

I doubt that anyone will controvert the suggestion that the Senate of the United States has never had, under their advisory capacity to the President of the United States, any office of graver import, of more far-reaching implications, of more stupendous power than the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. There has been no nomination to any office under the Executive power of appointment, whether it be of a Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, an Ambassador to the Court of St. James, a Secretary of War or Navy, even while our Nation was engaged in war, that rivals, nay equals, in magnitude the head and front of a commission that will hold within its grasp, for peace or for war, the destiny of our Nation.

The reality of atomic energy was beyond the ken and knowledge of anyone in all the world up to a few years ago. Its realism to this date is the gravest, most cataclysmic, and most tragic event in human history. Its potentialities even now lie beyond the utmost bounds of the human imagination.

The other day the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] gave a graphic picture of the ruin and desolation of Hiroshima, transformed instantaneously in a single blast, from hundreds of thousands of human souls and homes and buildings into mere ashes and dust blown hither and thither by the restless winds of the earth.

Yet, Mr. President, if Dame Rumor is to be credited, the blast that shattered Hiroshima is, in comparison with the destructive force of the atomic bomb today, as the noise of the pop gun to the blast of a cannon. The corporate body that will have control of the secrets of nuclear energy will have control of the life and death, not only of this Nation, but, in all probability, of all the habitable globe.

Shall we not then, in the exercise of our constitutional mandate to consent

and advise with the President on the appointment of various officers of our Government, exercise every possible precaution and take advantage of every avenue of information?

Mr. President, I digress for a moment from the theme of my discourse to pay a just tribute to the chairman of the Senate section of the Atomic Energy Committee, the Junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. He has, with some possible exceptions which I may note later, undertaken to place before the committee and the Senate the most pertinent facts concerning these appointments. While ardently advocating the cause of Mr. Lillenthal and the remaining appointees to the Commission, he has presented the case in their favor fairly. So far as the junior Senator from Iowa dealt with the record, he has been factually correct.

But, sir, the dominating conclusion that must leap into the senatorial mind after reading the record is that the most important avenues of information regarding the nominees have been left uncharted and unexplored. And, again, sir, fault cannot be ascribed to the chairman of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the absence of this information. Under date of February 25, as will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, 1947, the junior Senator from Iowa addressed a letter to the President of the United States wherein he said the committee would be asked on the floor of the Senate whether it had secured all available information. He pointed out that the importance of these appointments was so great that the committee felt obligated to request authority from the President to any investigating agencies of the executive or administrative branches of the Government to supply all information possessed by such agencies bearing upon each of the appointees, and he urges the President to make available to the committee such information and reports on these appointees, if any be possessed by the Chief Executive.

A refusal by the President was the response to the request of the committee. Rightly or wrongly, the President considered it would be best to follow the traditional course of keeping secret within the archives of the executive department information of such a character.

But, sir, the response of the President does not relieve us from our own responsibility to the American people. The obligation that rests upon us is too far-reaching in its import for us to stand upon the tradition which withholds from us the possibility, nay, the probability, of information vital to the discharge of our duties.

It is this thought, if I interpret correctly the motive of the junior Senator from Ohio, that prompted him to introduce the motion to recommit. Congress itself is, perhaps, not free from blame in this particular phase of the matter. When we enacted the Atomic Energy Commission law we provided for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to report on the qualifications, character, and loyalty of all employees under the Commission and its management. If it

be important for the Congress to be advised with respect to subordinates, it seems to me that it is far more important that the Congress should be advised as to the qualifications, character, and loyalty of those who control, employ, discharge, and exercise managerial control.

Mr. President, is there anything to be lost by conducting such an inquiry? May there not be much to be gained? Could not or would not the Senate be justly criticized for failure to supply itself with the information that the trained agencies of our Government—the FBI, Military Intelligence of the Army, and Office of Naval Intelligence—can supply us? It may be objected that such an investigation and report would result in delaying selection of the Commission. If any error is committed, it is far better for us to err on the safe side, on the side of caution and prudence, than to rush pell-mell, as it were, into the selection of appointees without having before us the best sources of information of which this great Government is capable of providing.

Let me point out in this connection that one of the greatest fallacies is the claim so often asserted that unless David Lillenthal is confirmed promptly, the atomic-energy work will be retarded. Before Mr. Lillenthal had any connection with the Atomic Energy Commission or with the problem of nuclear energy, these developments happened and were performed by the old Manhattan District under military control with General Groves at its head: First, the authorized distribution nationally of beneficial radioactive isotopes for use in medical and biological fields. Second, the authorized construction of a huge laboratory, namely, Brookhaven Laboratory, at the former Camp Upton site on Long Island for atomic energy developments in which universities of the Northeast will participate. Third, the authorized enlargement of the Argonne Laboratory in Chicago for atomic-energy work in which the universities of the Midwest will participate. Fourth, the authorized construction of a tremendous laboratory at Schenectady to be operated by General Electric for atomic-energy research. Has Mr. Lillenthal done anything more than what has already been done under military control and under the supervision of General Groves?

Mr. President, the inescapable truth is that at the present time the sole practical use of atomic energy is as a weapon of war. It can be developed and will be put to industrial use for peacetime purposes. But according to the best information available to me, at least 3 years will elapse before scientific research will have advanced sufficiently far to apply atomic energy to industrial purposes. On the other hand, I make bold to say that we do need, as a nation, for our self-preservation now—right now—the atomic bomb as a weapon of war. The need for the weapon has not been growing less since the creation of the United Nations. The need is, in truth, growing apace and too rapidly, I fear, for the maintenance of the peace of the world. If war should come, I should want this mighty weapon under the control of

those most experienced and best able to handle it in the hour of national peril. I believe that atomic energy should be under military control until there is an assurance that the threat of war is ended and that we have won the fight for peace. Then, but not until then, we may return it to a civilian commission which will consider it mainly, if not altogether, as an instrumentality of peace and not of war. Therefore, Mr. President, I very eagerly joined with the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECKRON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] in the introduction of a bill to amend the atomic energy law so as to place atomic energy under the control of the Secretary of State, Gen. George C. Marshall, the office of the Secretary of War, who is now Robert P. Patterson, and the office of the Secretary of the Navy, who is now James Forrestal, with two civilians to be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. President, is there any question whatsoever in the mind of any Senator that the patriotism, ability, loyalty, and character of George C. Marshall, if appointed the head of the Atomic Energy Commission, will ever be questioned? On the other hand, does anyone entertain the thought that if there were any serious question raised as to the qualifications of George C. Marshall, he would permit his name to remain for confirmation before the United States Senate?

General Marshall would know that the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission cannot serve in this exalted post of duty without having the unalloyed confidence of the Congress of the United States. The law creating the Commission requires that it shall be in constant cooperation with the Congress and that the Congress shall cooperate with the Commission.

Does Mr. Lillenthal enjoy this unqualified confidence of either the Congress or the American people? Is there not a very substantial number of the Members of the Senate, as well as of the House, who seriously and conscientiously object to confirmation of the Lillenthal nomination?

If Mr. Lillenthal possessed the high and noble character which his advocates claim for him, would he not, in the face of so strong an opposition, in the midst of a world crisis growing more and more critical hour by hour, repair to the White House and insist on having the President withdraw his nomination?

More than a month ago I stated in the public press that Mr. Lillenthal is not the indispensable man. There is not only George Marshall; there are scores of other men standing high in the confidence of the people of the United States who could head the Atomic Energy Commission, and with respect to whose nomination there would be neither doubt nor dispute.

The junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], speaking to his motion, has given us sufficient reliable information to warrant the adoption of his motion. He has shown that one-fifth of the key employees so far selected by the Atomic En-

ergy Commission under Mr. Lillenthal possess questionable backgrounds. Full information should be had with respect to those employees, and information could be had with respect to every other key employee. Above all, Mr. President, the Senate should have before it the reports of the skilled and seasoned investigating authorities of our Federal Government with reference to the Chairman and other members of the Commission.

Mr. President, we must rise to the height of this great argument. We must act with the deliberation, the calmness, and the care that befit our high office. It is true of nations, as it is of men, that there is a tide in their affairs, "which taken at the flood, leads on to fortune; omitted, all the voyage of their life is bound in shallows and in miseries."

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks about the nomination of Mr. Lillenthal, and then I wish to discuss the Greek situation for a time.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the opposition to Mr. Lillenthal is just part of the general hysteria which appears to have gripped the country and which is similar to the hysteria which swept our Nation after World War I, when there arose a great fear of communism and of persons who might be Communists or Reds. A year or so ago those who wished to discredit a man completely called him a Communist. But now, Mr. President, the day has come—some may call it a happy day, although I do not regard it in that light—when some of the Members of this body say they are going to vote against Mr. Lillenthal because he is a New Dealer. They have bracketed the New Dealers with the "Commies" and pretty soon they will do the same with all Democrats, regardless of whether they are New Dealers. A little later in my remarks I should like to point out that even the Republicans are becoming involved in this process to such an extent that they find they cannot oppose certain measures for fear they will be called Communists.

Today the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has asked whether the committee called before it, to testify, the Members of Congress who were severe critics of Mr. Lillenthal—Members of Congress before whom Mr. Lillenthal has appeared at committee hearings in the past. Those are not the exact words of the Senator from Washington, but I have stated them as nearly as I was able to note them at the time.

Perhaps I may give a general example of the attitude of the Congressmen before whom Mr. Lillenthal has appeared in the past—when he appeared, I assume, seeking appropriations for the TVA or in connection with other matters relating to the administration of that greatest of all governmental agencies, I believe, at least insofar as certain undertakings are concerned. In 1945, Mr. President, I made a trip to the Tennessee Valley Authority. We were contemplating, and still are, having a Columbia Valley Authority in the Northwest, and I wished to see how the Tennessee Valley Authority

was functioning. So I made a trip there, at my own expense, to see for myself. On the way down I had a lower berth, near the rear end of the car. From stateroom A, near the front of the car, came noises of loud singing. From the general tone and contour of the music, Mr. President, as it emerged from the stateroom, I could tell that the singers were feeling quite happy. I wondered who they might be; because, strange as it may seem, although, as I have said, it was obvious judging from the sounds which emerged from the room, that the singers were a little overly joyful, at the same time most of the songs were hymns. I had never heard a mixture of that kind before, and I wondered who they might be. In a short time a gentleman came out of the stateroom and started down the aisle toward me. I recognized him as a very prominent Republican Congressman and it later developed that he was one of those to whom the Senator from Washington has referred as having had Mr. Lillenthal before them for questioning at various times. He came down the aisle, and I recognized him; and when he got within 10 or 15 feet of me he recognized me, and stopped and said to me, "Well, well. There is the very fellow we are looking for, the singing cowboy from Idaho. Come on up here, TAYLOR, come on. Come up here and help us sing some songs. You're just the man we want."

So I got up and went with him to the stateroom—and there they were, about a dozen gentlemen, lined up on both sides of a long table, and the bottles were lined up shoulder to shoulder—square bottles, none of the plain old round ones. I sat down with them and partook of their merriment and helped them sing hymns. Mr. President, I like to sing hymns. My father was a minister of the gospel. They were going down to Tennessee, also, but they were not going to see the Tennessee Valley Authority. Mr. President, it seems that the Aluminum Corp. of America has a great establishment in Tennessee, sort of a resort where it takes folks whom it likes to impress, and entertains them at the expense of the corporation. These gentlemen were heading down there, not to see the TVA, but to enjoy a vacation at the expense of the Aluminum Corp. of America. Everything was very cozy. There was a young chap, with a fine personality, from the Aluminum Corp., and he was shepherding them along. He was opening the bottles, and he had a towel over his arm to keep them shipshape and to wipe off lapels, and to do one thing and another; and, Mr. President, he even had a pitchpipe to give the boys the key to sing the hymns.

I sat there and listened. I do not think I violate any confidence—because there was no secret about what they were saying—when I state that the whole subject of their conversation was Lillenthal. Not once on the whole trip did I hear one of them question Mr. Lillenthal's ability. Not once did I hear them say that he was an incompetent nincompoop, and that we should get rid of him for that reason. But they kept harping on the statement that they must get rid

of Lillenthal. This was about the tone of their conversation:

"Do you remember, Bill?"—

If any of them was named Bill, I apologize. If I give a name resembling anyone's real name it is purely coincidental.

"Do you remember, Bill, when we had that son of a gun up before us and you asked him the question about such and such? I thought you had him there. But you remember he came right back and had the answer on the tip of his tongue. He is the smartest son of a gun I ever saw."

Except that they used stronger language than that. [Laughter.]

That went on for hours on end. We would sing awhile and then we would get back to Lillenthal, and they would reminisce about how they had had him before their committee, how they tried to question him, tried to prove he was incompetent, and every time he got the best of them. They hated him bitterly, and they kept repeating, "He is the smartest so-and-so I ever saw, and we have got to get rid of him."

Mr. President, I believe that same feeling of envious hatred is behind a great deal of the desire to get rid of Mr. Lillenthal. Atomic power is going to be a great thing in the future of this country, a source of power possibly much more profitable than electrical energy, which has certainly proven profitable to some private interests. As now constituted, the Atomic Energy Act proposes that the Government shall control atomic energy. I feel that there are those who would like to see it turned over to private enterprise for exploitation. Some do not want Mr. Lillenthal because he has administered the TVA in a manner to carry out the mandate of the Congress, to furnish a yardstick, to supply cheap power to the people of the Tennessee Valley region. So, Mr. President, I feel that here is a very good example of much of the enmity toward Mr. Lillenthal, not that he is incapable, but that he is too capable, and his opponents are afraid they will not be able to get atomic energy away from him if he ever is placed in control, and that he will really carry out the wishes of the people of the country. I think there are many others who feel as those gentlemen on the train, that he is just too smart, and they do not want him in the position to which he has been appointed. He is too smart and too honest.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 31, 1947, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 918) to establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the selective service records, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting

sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Richard C. O'Connell, of Maryland, to be United States marshal for the district of Maryland, vice August Klecka, deceased.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like now to discuss the proposal to aid Greece and Turkey. I feel this matter is being rushed through the Congress, that is, that there is an attempt to rush it through with altogether too much haste and too little consideration of such an important question. I feel it is one of the most important matters ever to come before the Congress, certainly since I have been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Is the Senator talking now about Mr. Lilienthal?

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator spoke of rushing things with haste. I thought he was talking about Lilienthal.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have left the discussion of Mr. Lilienthal. I am now going to Greece and Turkey.

I believe the question of aid to Greece and Turkey should have the fullest consideration and discussion. Some of us would like to know whether this is a humanitarian undertaking, whether we are doing it to aid the Greek people. We would like to know perhaps whether we are doing it to pull British chestnuts out of the fire, to preserve British investments in Greece. Some of us would like to know whether this commits us irrevocably to a policy of imperialism.

That question was raised in my mind very forcibly a few days ago when I happened to pick up a copy of the United States News. I would not say that the United States News is the organ of the National Association of Manufacturers, or anything of that kind, but it is edited by David Lawrence, a reactionary gentleman, to my way of thinking. He is closely associated with the big fellows who have a great deal to do with formulating our national policies whether we like it or not. So word coming from the United States News should have a certain amount of authenticity.

On the first page of the United States News is the Newsgram, the secret news, the inside dope of what is going on in Washington. There is so much of this secret news that four pages are needed to carry it. But it starts out like this:

It isn't to be so bad—this job of trying to run the world. It seems that somebody has to run it. Britain can't, Russia will, if United States doesn't.

I wonder, Mr. President, if Mr. Lawrence knows anything about what he is talking of when he says we are setting

out to run the world. That is what he says. He proceeds:

If Russia is ready to stop her foolishness, the United Nations could function and United States in that way could let a world organization do more of the job.

I am sure it would be very kind of us to let the United Nations have a little more to say as to how the world should be run. They would appreciate it, I am sure. Mr. Lawrence sets forth a program which he says is going to be our foreign policy. It is a blueprint for imperialism if I ever saw one.

He says:

A \$31,885,000,000 United States-aid and development program is in the works. Most of that program has had Congress approval. You get the story on page 11.

He says capital equipment is to be supplied in large volume, food and clothing are to continue to pour out of the United States—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did I hear the figures correctly—\$31,000,000,000?

Mr. TAYLOR. Thirty-one billion eight hundred and eighty-five million dollars. He forgot the cents.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the article show where it is to be spent?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; he has not a breakdown of it, but I read what he said. I do not know whether he knows what he is talking about or not. I am merely reading it, because this is a reputable magazine, and Mr. Lawrence is a very reputable reporter—on the conservative side.

Mr. WHERRY. One would not think that was very conservative—\$31,000,000,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. It probably is conservative. Perhaps it is more than that; I do not know.

Mr. Lawrence says further:

Dollars, on loan, to be translated into goods are supplied liberally by government, and private capital for foreign investment soon is to be tapped.

Brains, engineering brains, financing brains, administrative brains, are to be exported in large quantities. Some military brains will go, too.

Thank God for that, Mr. President. We should keep a few brains here, but there are lots of them of that type that we could send abroad, so far as I am concerned.

United States has about everything to offer if the outside world will cooperate. Big figures, big jobs no longer awe Americans. There is a \$341,000,000,000 investment already made in war, a \$31,885,000,000 war investment already either set or about to be set. United States couldn't pull back now, if it wanted to.

We have gone so far, he says, that we are sunk, we cannot hold back, we are committed to imperialism, and that ends the matter. He goes on to say:

Russia, by contrast, offers these things for export:

Revolution—a technique for Communist Party members to gain power.

Police to advise on terror and methods of dealing with opponents.

Requisition teams to drain away available supplies to Russia.

He says that is what the Russians have to offer. That does not sound to me very inviting. If that is what they have to offer, I should not think we would worry very much.

Against that background, these conclusions seem evident.

He says:

Europe, outside the Russian sphere, will be set up in business again.

I should like to have this entire article printed in the Record at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. TAYLOR. He says further, Mr. President:

Taxes need not be higher for the United States venture in world leadership. Tax reduction, in any event, is tied to the level of prosperity. Prosperity levels will relate directly to United States postwar investment in world development, to the very large flow of dollars and goods abroad, and to the large flow of foreign goods into United States. A profit is possible, in the end, on United States venturing abroad. Profit, however, will come only if United States can figure out how to let other nations pay the interest and principal on their loans by selling goods in the United States market. That is a problem that can be deferred during the period ahead when the big-scale investment will be in capital equipment to produce goods. New loans in this period will greatly exceed the scheduled payments.

In other words, we are just going to pour out the money, and then we will worry about some scheme to try to get it back after a while. He says:

What does seem more probable for United States is this:

Universal military training will probably become inevitable.

They are going to get us so deep in involvements that we will have universal military training, whether we like it or not.

Training at the start—

Very subtle—

is likely to be for 6 months, not a year.

We will just start easy and sneak up on the folks, so to speak, as we go along.

Army-Navy-Air Forces size will remain far above prewar.

Now, Mr. President, this is the best thing I have read in a long time. A week ago Sunday, in the Associated Press Round-Up in the Washington Post, I believe it was, it was stated that very few Senators would dare vote against the Greek proposition because they were afraid of being smeared with the Communist label. Well, sir, here it is, a little more specific. It says:

Congress cannot easily back out of commitments made and being made. A Republican-Communist axis in United States seems very unlikely.

Well, they have got it down to the point where the poor Republicans cannot vote their convictions for fear of being called Communists. We are in the same boat together; the Red hunt has got us all. We have got to go along here,

and go out and embark on this imperialistic course, because if we do not, we will all be Communists, Republicans and Democrats alike. It is a great technique, one followed by Adolf Hitler. He called all of his opponents Communists, and he got rid of all of them, finally, and just ran things to suit himself. The article continues:

Isolationists now find themselves aligned with United States Communists, now find that their position, politically, is not what it once was. A crisis in far-off Greece thus is fixing United States postwar foreign policy.

May I say, Mr. President, that a crisis in Germany was the excuse to do away with civil liberties, and brought on the reign of Adolf Hitler. They had to have a crisis, so they set the Reichstag on fire and burned it down, and then they blamed the Communists, and got rid of them. Then they got rid of the Socialists, then they got rid of the labor unions, and then Adolf had everything his own way, and everybody lived happily ever after.

It looks to me, Mr. President, whether we realize it, whether those who are guiding our destinies realize it or not, as though we are being jockeyed into the very same position here, getting into a crisis on this Greek question, where nobody can speak up for fear of being called a Communist, practically a traitor to our country, subversive, trying to help Russia. They will get us in that position, face to face with Russia, snarling at each other, and they can do anything—take our civil liberties away from us, and deprive us of the very things that we claim we are going out to fight for.

Oh, yes. I mentioned that they had four pages of this secret news here. The section in the back of the publication has an interesting item or two in it. Let us go over to one in the back. Here is a very interesting statement:

United States business is to be affected directly by United States decision to underwrite world rebuilding, to take leadership in reorganizing the world.

Dollars are to flow out faster on loan and as gifts.

Trade will be high and active, wherever the dollars flow.

Price levels will tend to be supported by heavy world demand for many types of goods, sale of which will be financed by United States loans.

Mr. President, we have not been able to figure out how to give the American people enough money to buy all the things we can produce in this country, so we are going to loan the money, give it away, throw it all over the world, and let them buy the goods, our workers will produce them, and then we will give away half of it. That is what it amounts to, so we can consume the other half here at home.

Taxes will remain relatively high to support the military establishment required to assure order in the world and to underwrite the loan program. Businessmen will do well to get deeply interested in world trade, to find where they may fit into what obviously is to be an expanding field of United States interest and activity abroad.

I hope the Senate will listen to this statement, Mr. President:

It's to be settled now that the flag will follow the dollar into the far reaches of many areas in the world.

We have heard about that all our lives, how the flag has followed Standard Oil and these other boys into the far reaches of the world. Here it is, in this publication, which caters to businessmen and pretends to have the inside dope on what the business future of this Nation may be. Well, we have read enough of that, Mr. President.

I would like to read a clipping I tore out of the paper last night. It is about Judge Goldsborough. We all remember him. He is the gentleman that gave John L. Lewis such a sock on the jaw a while back. It says:

GOLDSBOROUGH URGES ACTION TO DEFEAT DEPRESSION

PHILADELPHIA, MARCH 29.—Justice T. Alan Goldsborough, of the District of Columbia, suggests establishment of permanent consumer credit to help defeat the depression he says is inevitable in this country.

Justice Goldsborough, who enjoined John L. Lewis and his AFL United Mine Workers from striking against the Government, predicted also that the United States would not become prosperous from foreign trade.

Addressing the eighth annual meeting of the Maryland Society of Pennsylvania last night, Justice Goldsborough said that to his knowledge the United States has been lending money to foreign governments for more than a quarter of a century to buy our goods and return nothing for it.

"In other words, we have been trying to get rich by giving our wealth away. Expressed in another way, we do not know enough to distribute to our own people, so we just give it away," Justice Goldsborough said.

Well, I think the justice stated the case very well, Mr. President. We all know that during the war we expanded our production very greatly. About half of our production roughly was in consumer goods, things that people could eat and wear and use. The other half was in guns and planes and tanks that were destroyed. And yet the consumers of this country, the workers principally, who produced this 100 percent of goods, received only sufficient money to buy the 50 percent that was turned out in consumer goods. They did not save a great deal. They saved some money, but not much.

So, Mr. President, we are faced with this situation: The war is over, and now instead of 50 percent consumer goods, we are going to produce 100 percent consumer goods. Who is going to buy the additional 50 percent? During the war 50 percent of production was financed by borrowing from the Government. That money went to the workers who produced the goods, and still they could buy only half of the total amount of goods produced. The other half went for destruction. Who is now going to buy the additional 50 percent, which, during the war represented production for the purpose of destruction?

The wages, the actual take-home pay of workers is less than it was during the war. We have barely turned our production machine around on the track. It is hardly out of the roundhouse. It is just getting up steam and already surpluses are appearing in certain lines, although the production machine has just begun moving. From one side of

the machine comes 100 percent of consumer goods and out of the other side comes the same old amount of wages, only sufficient to buy 50 percent of those goods. What is going to happen? The goods are going to pile up along the tracks and pretty soon the engineers, the boys who operate the economy of the country for us, the big fellows, will look back and find that these goods are not being taken up, and they will shut down the factory, throwing its employees out of work, and they will not be able to buy consumer goods, and that will result in the shutting down of another factory, and that will be followed by the shutting down of another factory, and like a line of 10 pins 10 miles long they will fall down one after the other. Then they just padlock the doors of our wonderful productive machine. Some of the fat boys who made sufficient money during the war will go to Palm Beach and sun themselves, but not so the American workers, Mr. President.

We can face this problem squarely, and endeavor to find ways and means to make our private enterprise, our capitalistic economy, function here at home, or we can take this phoney way of loaning money, or rather giving it away all over the world, to buy our surplus goods, and it seems to me Mr. President, that that is what the Greek situation is the beginning of. It seems we are throwing money around the world so those who receive it can come to us and buy the goods which we do not have sense enough to figure out how to distribute to our own people at home.

Do not misunderstand me, Mr. President. I want to help the Greek people. I want to help people anywhere who need help, and I want to help democratic governments to stay in power and become strong. But when I say I want to help democratic governments, that statement by no stretch of the imagination applies to the present government of Greece, and much less to the present government of Turkey.

Mr. President, as each day passes, the crisis in our foreign relations grows more acute. Last week's headlines spoke of military intervention in Greece and Turkey. This week's headlines speak of Korea, and of giving naval vessels to Greece and Turkey. Where are we traveling, and how fast? Why are we proposing to give naval vessels to Greece? As I understand, their problem is that of driving the guerrillas out of the mountains, and I do not believe any naval vessels could proceed up into the mountains and help drive the guerrillas from them.

I am deeply concerned over the apparent attempt which is being made in some sections of the press so to whip up hysteria, so to awaken the fears and dreads of the American people, that careful and thorough deliberation by Congress on the whole question of our foreign policy will be impossible.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator think the American people are at all disturbed about the attitude which the

Russian Government has taken respecting the atomic situation?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have not received any letters from them bearing on that situation, because it really has not been brought to a head. I imagine they are disturbed. I am.

Mr. McMAHON. Is the Senator disturbed at all over the Russian attitude on the atomic situation?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, I am. I should like to see an agreement reached in some way. But I do not think we are going to make the Russians agree to anything, I may say—

Mr. McMAHON. Whose fault does the Senator think it is that we have not reached the agreement?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is probably the Russians' fault. I am not an expert on the matter. I have had my hands full here, and have not been able to keep up with all that is going on in the UN.

Mr. McMAHON. There is nothing probable about it. It is a fact that it is the Russians' fault. Is it not?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will take the Senator's word for it. He is more of an expert in that field than I am.

Mr. McMAHON. Greece and other nations who are members of the UN have agreed to atomic-energy control—all except Russia and Poland. Whether or not it is Russia's fault that we have not reached an agreement, that is the record, is it not?

Mr. TAYLOR. I presume so, yes; I am quite certain of that fact; but I do not think that giving the Greeks warships is going to settle the atomic question, Mr. President. I am happy, however, to announce that, so far as I can observe, the public has retained its ability to analyze the situation coolly and objectively. My mail is running 95 percent against the Turkey-Greece unilateral military intervention plan, as opposed to pure relief and rehabilitation. I may say that at least 95 percent urge that this question be handled through the United Nations. They do not know how it is to be done. They simply are afraid that the UN is being crippled, and they do not want that to happen. I have never received as many letters from my own State of Idaho on any subject as I have on this, and, with just a few exceptions, my fellow Idahoans agree with me that the plan is an unwise and dangerous one.

The Turkey-Greece plan has been presented in various costumes. On some occasions it wears the wings of an angel of mercy—it is a plan for aid to the war victims in devastated lands. This costume is not a comfortable one, however, for it does not fit the Turkish situation at all. Turkey is fat with war profits. It played both sides during the war, and it played them very profitably. It sold critical supplies to us and to the Germans at exorbitant prices, and it received a great deal of aid for good will.

On other occasions, the plan is dressed in the armor of a protector of Greece against the advancing hordes of communism. The gallant warriors of the State Department, with their well-polished attaché cases bravely borne by well-manicured fingers, come riding down to the caucus room like the gallant 300 who held the pass at Thermopylae.

But the anti-Communist guise hardly fits either, for the Greek Government bears no relationship whatever to democracy, and it is not combating communism. Indeed, for every Greek who was converted to communism by Russian propaganda last week, 100 have been converted to it by the present Greek regime, and by our State Department's insistence that the only alternative to that regime is communism.

Mr. President, that assertion is simply not true. Greece need not choose between a tyrannical, repressive monarchy on the Fascist pattern on the one hand, and a Communist dictatorship on the other. The Greek people, if given a free choice, might well—and I am convinced they would—decide upon a government on the democratic pattern of the western world, a government of, by, and for the people, a government which would look after the well-being of its subjects and still preserve and protect the civil liberties of the individual and retain the benefits of a free enterprise economy.

It is to our everlasting shame that we are not helping them make that free choice. And it is to the everlasting shame of the British Empire—a shame that stands not alone, but rather following a long list of shames and infamies, a list long enough to extend from the top of London Tower to the Black Hole of Calcutta—that the government of Winston Churchill deliberately, maliciously, and intentionally set about to wreck Greek freedom and to subject Greece to a selfish clique of rulers headed by a dissolute puppet king who has not one drop of Greek blood coursing through his veins. And all to protect British investments.

Let me briefly trace the history of that shame.

When the British first landed in Athens in October 1944 they were wildly hailed as liberators. British flags and Churchill's picture adorned the streets. Greeks expected the British to follow the Germans and wipe them out. Instead, the British stayed in Athens while the Germans slowly retreated, intact and unmolested, westward across Greece into Yugoslavia, burning and pillaging Greek towns and destroying the year's harvest as they went.

The British had more important business in Athens. They had to subjugate their allies, the Greeks, instead of their enemies, the Germans. During the summer of 1944, the British had established in Cairo a puppet Greek government of royalist flavor headed by a petty politician named Papandreou. The EAM resistance leaders, fighting an underground warfare against the Germans in Greece, smuggled out some leaders, who asked for representation in the new government for the Greek patriots fighting and dying in Greece valiantly and effectively enough to pin down 15 German divisions for 4 years. But the British met the EAM delegates with harsh words and handcuffs.

During the summer of 1944, there were reported to be 9,000 Greek servicemen held by the British in concentration camps because they had been overheard expressing sentiments derogatory to the King of Greece. I have heard of a young Greek lieutenant who had been im-

prisoned and stripped of his rank because he had said in the hearing of a Britisher that he hoped Greece would have a democracy, not a monarchy, after the war. In late 1945 these prisoners were still in British concentration camps.

Recently I talked with a young lady who was in Greece with UNRRA. She was there when the British came. She saw the joy of the people at the arrival of their saviors, so-called. Then the British insisted that the heroic resistance fighters lay down their arms but let the royalist collaborators keep theirs. The fighters who had been fighting the Germans did not want to lay down their arms unless the others did, and they planned a large mass meeting in protest. They obtained the consent of the British general—I have forgotten what his name was—and then he decided to call the mass meeting off. He called it off at 10 o'clock at night. There were few newspapers and few radio sets, so the word did not get around and the next morning the people congregated in the square. This girl said she was there with them, circulating around to see what was going on. The British had stationed royalist Greeks on housetops surrounding the square. The people did not know that the meeting had been called off. When the first speaker rose to speak machine guns started rattling from the tops of the buildings, mowing down the people in the square. She said there were two correspondents in American uniforms standing there, and after the first burst of gunfire the Greeks saw the American soldiers and ran over toward them, falling down on their knees and shouting "Roosevelt! Roosevelt!" The royalists continued to strafe the people, shooting at them until the crowd was dispersed.

This girl then stated that a 7 o'clock curfew was imposed. The next night she was in her room. Across from her on the corner was a Greek peddler who sold little knickknacks from an orange crate. The hour of 7 o'clock approached and about 2 minutes before 7 o'clock he made a sale. He did not have his wares in order to close business promptly at 7. He was trying to get his wares gathered up as fast as he could, and a British tank came down the street. She saw it coming. At about 5 after 7, without one word of warning, the Greek peddler was mowed down by machine-gun fire. She said she talked with many Greeks she knew who were not Communists, and when they saw these things they said, "We cannot go for this." They fled to the mountains, and they are probably there to this day, fighting the unholy regime and the alliance which Great Britain has set up to protect her investments or her lifeline.

The British were determined to bring back the monarchy. Only through the twice-exiled George could the British hope to keep their heavy investments in Greece tax-free and profitable. George II, King of the Greeks, has not one drop of Greek blood in him. His full name is George Schleswig-Holstein Sonderburg Gluckburg. His people have twice exiled him, assassinated his grandfather and twice exiled his great grandfather, who was the first of the dynasty,

a German princeling whom the British forced on the Greeks after helping them to throw off Turkish rule 100 years ago.

The British proceeded with dispatch after they entered Athens. First, a British proclamation ordered all Greek resistance fighters to turn over their arms to the British. But the British had: The Third Armored Division equipped with heavy tanks; the RAF using bombers and strafers; the Greek Mountain Brigade, organized by the British in Egypt by enlisting Greek royalists and antirepublicans; the X-ites, the fanatical secret band of royalist ruffians and terrorists; and the security battalions, the Greek quisling internal police formed by the Germans and used to hunt down Greek patriots under the Nazi occupation. The British took over these collaborationist security battalions unpurged, and rearmed with American lend-lease weapons. All the Greek royalist and British forces remained armed to the teeth with heavy weapons. The resistance leaders countered the British order with the suggestion that all the Greek forces be dissolved. This was rejected by the British.

A second proclamation lowered wages and raised prices. Athens was a city of a million and a half, but only 20,000 wage earners were working. The average wage was the equivalent of \$1.40 a day. The British raised the price of food to the point where the daily relief ration cost 80 cents a day. The ration cost the British about a tenth of this. The food was American food.

The reason for the British profiteering on relief supplies is clear. There were to be no large revenue-producing taxes levied by the new Greek Government. Most of the income-producing property in Greece is British-owned or controlled. The streetcar company, the railroad, the public utilities, the dock facilities, the rich tobacco lands, the olive presses, and the oil company, are all British.

There are very few wealthy Greeks, and these few are the royalists who collaborate with the British. Consequently, the Greek Government does not levy taxes which will seriously burden these holdings. To this day it finances itself largely through the sale of relief supplies—supplies which American citizens taxed themselves to lend-lease to the British to give to the poor of Greece. The poor in Greece cannot afford to buy relief rations at the prices at which they are sold.

Why are the Greeks so poor today? Part of the tragedy, of course, is due to the German invasion and occupation, but only a part. Much of it is due to the corruption and dishonesty of the Greek Government.

Against the advice of American advisers, the Greek Government began selling gold sovereigns in February 1946. By July 1946 UNRRA reported the Greek gold supply as \$21,200,000. Today, Mr. President, there is very little of that gold left.

In the United States it is illegal to possess and hoard gold. In Greece it is not. Indeed, hoarding was made possible by the Greek Government, and today most of Greece's gold is in private

hands—mostly in the hands of speculators and black-market traders. There is no way of telling how much of it has been exported out of the country.

Mr. President, is there any wonder that the Greek Government lacks credit in the world markets? Is there any wonder that Greece suffers from a shortage of foreign exchange?

The second great factor in the loss of Greek foreign exchange was the policy of permitting virtually unrestricted sale of foreign exchange for importation. This took place between February and December 1946, when it had to be stopped because there was no more foreign exchange to sell.

Much of this foreign money went into needed imports. But a great percentage of it, certainly more than a desperately impoverished country seeking to rebuild its economy could afford, went into so-called luxury goods.

This was the type of goods that could be sold profitably on the black market at huge profits. This did not set the wheels of real economic recovery in motion.

In December controls were established, but when the barn door was closed, the horse had already run a long way down the road to ruin.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I wondered whether the able Senator from Idaho had noticed an item in, I believe, a newspaper yesterday purporting to quote, I think, the Prime Minister, or one of the members of the Government of Greece, commenting upon some suggestions which Mr. Paul Porter had made to the effect that there would have to be certain conditions imposed upon the funds which this Nation would advance to Greece, and that the Greek Government hoped that it would be American policy, if we advanced the funds, to cooperate with them in the very informal and very friendly way which the British Economic Mission had employed, and not to lay down too many conditions regarding the use of the funds.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not read that item, but of course, Mr. President, I will say, and I feel it is no breach of confidence, that the Senator from Florida, some others, and myself talked to Mr. Acheson about this matter, and he said plainly that we could not lay down conditions as to what form the Greek Government should take, for instance whether it should become more democratic, because then we would be interfering in the internal affairs of a foreign nation and would indeed find ourselves squarely athwart the United Nations. So, all we can do is to make polite suggestions about the matter, and if, as the Senator from Florida says, they are not kindly disposed, they are under no obligation whatever to do anything that this Nation may suggest.

American banking experts who opposed the sale of Greece's gold to private individuals believed that the only possible answer to Greece's inflation, in addition to the prime one of production, was a capital levy and heavy taxation of war and postwar profits.

Mr. President, permit me to read from the official report on Greece of the Food

and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which was issued earlier in this month. The restrained and objective language of this report conveys a devastating picture of the nature of the Greek Government today. I read as follows:

At the present time, the civil service as a whole and the agricultural sections of it to which the Mission has given special attention suffer from several shortcomings, including the exclusive reliance on seniority in promotions; excessive centralization of control in Athens; frequent political interference, both in the appointment and the discharge of personnel; an exceedingly inadequate scale of civil-service pay, especially for the more responsible officials; unduly short working hours; and conflicting and duplicating allocation of administrative responsibility.

Elements in the reform of civil service: To correct these conditions, the reform of the Greek civil service should include measures along lines such as the following:

Discharge of all unnecessary and supernumerary employees, possibly with a year's separation pay in lieu of pension.

Introduction of a strict merit system, rating the efficiency of employees, discharging inefficient employees, and giving rapid promotion to superior employees.

Raising public salary rates toward pre-war purchasing power levels, and widening the range between lower and higher positions.

Further on the report states:

The mission recommends that the Greek Government adopt a policy of reforming its tax system, with the objective of shifting as rapidly as possible from taxes which bear heavily on low-income farmers and workers toward more emphasis on taxes which bear on those better able to pay, such as taxes on income, inheritances, property rents, luxuries, and so forth.

Mr. President, I think it might be pertinent to ask at this point: What do we intend to do about these recommendations? Has there been any indication, from administration sources, that any of these much needed reforms are to take place? Beyond the bare mention of a plan to send "experts," I have not heard of any. Indeed, I have not even heard any official spokesman publicly concede that the present Greek Government is corrupt and venal. It is constantly pictured as a "democracy."

Mr. President, until we make the healthy decision to face facts about Greece, we cannot even begin to make a start toward solving the Greek problem.

We have good reason to be suspicious of the atmosphere of crisis and the fanfare which surrounds this demand for a radical change in our foreign policy. I call attention to an article by Arthur Krock in the New York Times of March 23. Mr. Krock states that it was decided as long ago as the London Conference of Foreign Ministers—that was in September 1945—that there was no real hope for enduring peace in the continued "policy of appeasement and official treatment of Russia as a government friendly to the United States."

According to Mr. Krock, the President "made up his mind then that, when a fitting opportunity arose and one which Congress and the people would recognize as such, he would proclaim the new doctrine. On several occasions he thought

the time had come, but some of his important advisers talked him out of it.

"The British note of economic and military withdrawal from Greece, culminating a situation of which Washington had been wholly aware as it developed, pointed to a vacuum which the President found suited to the long-held purpose," Mr. Krock concludes.

The Greek situation, then, seems to be simply a convenient peg on which to hang a policy decided upon long ago. This is clearly a policy believed to be too unpopular to propose before this and too unpopular to offer at the present moment except in an atmosphere of crisis when people are apt to act rashly, without much thought.

Several dispatches by the well-informed diplomatic correspondent of the New York Times, James Reston, bear this out:

There is very little new in the situation in Greece—

Mr. Reston wrote in the Times March 7. He reported that the British Cabinet's decision last year to cut its overseas commitments was described at length to former Secretary of State Byrnes in Paris last summer. And he stated frankly that—

The executive branch of the Government feels it cannot get the cooperation of the legislature unless it places before it a specific proposal about a specific country in an atmosphere of crisis.

In later dispatches, Mr. Reston explained how the Greek crisis was being built up by the State Department through unofficial talks in which key correspondents were impressed with the so-called Russian danger, and its connection with the Greek problem.

Both Mr. Krock and Mr. Reston emphasize in their dispatches—as have many commentators—that the President's new policy is a global one, with no limits put on the type or scope of our proposed support, and no definition made of free peoples. As Mr. Krock says, it—

commits the United States to unlimited expenditures for an unlimited future and to whatever economic and military consequences may accrue.

A more complete appraisal of the true cost of the program, according to Mr. Reston, writing in the New York Times of March 16, would be \$5,000,000,000 a year. However, the State Department, Mr. Reston says, was afraid that if it asked for so large an immediate appropriation, it would run the risk of being repudiated altogether. So it adopted, in Reston's words, the "one-step-at-a-time technique."

The State Department felt, and again I quote Mr. Reston, that—

the Congress would not face up to the kind of fundamental long-range expensive program necessary * * * and had to be nursed along a step at a time.

Mr. Reston emphasized that the State Department feels—

that the most successful way to introduce a foreign policy in Congress is to oversell it piecemeal in an atmosphere of crisis. * * * The same technique of overstatement in time of crisis is being applied on Capitol Hill on the Greek and Turkish loan.

Mr. President, neither we in Congress, nor the people in this country are children to be nursed along, one step at a time, on a dangerous path whose ending we cannot see. We must not let ourselves be deceived by the artificial crisis that has been created. We must not be driven to rash action by the false urgency that has been injected into this question.

Let me say here, Mr. President, that I regret very much that we must rely for our information about the real intentions and purposes of our policy makers on newspaper writers who have very close ties to the State Department. The real objectives of our foreign policy are the concern of Congress and the people, and should be clear and above-board at all times. Instead, they are more and more cloaked in a veil of secrecy, which is lifted only occasionally—sometimes opportunely and sometimes accidentally—by favored writers who increasingly tend to become propagandists for the official view. This is the way to stifle the expression of opposition views and to block informed discussion. We are being subjected to a "propaganda by leaks," which is not unlike the traditional Chinese water torture.

In the present instance, we must insist upon a clear and specific statement of the objectives of this program and all that it includes, and a careful study of all that it implies, both at home and abroad.

Let me ask at this point whether we are, in fact, going to be committed to a \$31,885,000,000 program, as I mentioned earlier in my remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator given Mr. Reston's qualifications? I do not understand what they are.

Mr. TAYLOR. He is a foreign affairs and diplomatic correspondent for the New York Times.

Mr. WHERRY. Was he in contact with the Under Secretary of State?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know with whom he has been in contact; but he seems to have special sources of information and the New York Times is a reputable newspaper and it is usually conceded that his words should have some basis of fact.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not quite understand the Senator's observation.

Mr. TAYLOR. Of course, I should much prefer to quote the State Department, but we cannot get anything from the State Department directly.

Mr. WHERRY. Did Mr. Reston obtain from the State Department his figures about the \$5,000,000,000 program?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know where he got his figures, but his advance announcements have often been proved to be authoritative.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has just stated that he cannot get any information from the State Department. Let

me inquire whether the Senator has found time to read what Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs William Clayton have said before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee upon this question.

Mr. TAYLOR. No; I have not read the full testimony. I have read the rather full reports that appeared in the newspapers. That is all the information which the American people have on which to base their conclusions.

Mr. LUCAS. I commend their testimony to the Senator, in view of the fact that he has made much ado about an article by David Lawrence which appeared in the United States News. I am sure that after the Senator from Idaho reads the testimony of both those gentlemen—as I have had an opportunity to do—he will find that the Senators on the committee were rather thorough and exhaustive in their questions and the Under Secretaries were frank and forthright in their explanations and replies. In short, it seems to me that a full disclosure of everything of material value was submitted to the committee by Under Secretary of State Acheson and Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs Clayton. I also understand that additional witnesses are to appear before the hearings are over. I hope the Senator will read all the testimony. If he does, I believe he may wish to change some of the statements he has made about the State Department.

Mr. TAYLOR. If I find that I am wrong, I certainly shall be glad to change my statements. I was never one to be dogmatic or to stick to something when I found it was wrong.

Mr. LUCAS. The point which I desire to emphasize is that testimony has come to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations from the Office of the Secretary of State; yet the Senator from Idaho has not seen fit to obtain that testimony. The Senator takes the United States News as his authority. This is being done before all the evidence has been submitted to the committee and before all the witnesses have been heard. With all due deference to my good friend, I think he might have waited until the hearings were over and until he had the benefit of all the testimony before making the present argument. I submit that would have been the better course for the Senator to pursue, rather than to present to the Senate at this time his conclusion based upon some newspaper or magazine article. I am sure the writers therein do not know as much about the subject matter at hand as do those who are in the Office of the Secretary of State. It is the business of Secretaries of State to keep up with world affairs affecting the security of this Nation. There is a peculiar knowledge—a thorough understanding, and should be received with great solemnity and respect. Their opinions should be given great weight by Members of the Senate in reaching their final decision.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this time?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish the distinguished Senator to understand that I was not questioning the figures in any way, but I was interested in the Senator's quotation of a statement by Mr. Reston regarding a program of \$5,000,000,000 a year, which, as I understood, was to extend into the future. Did I correctly understand the statement?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is what I said.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to know whether Mr. Reston had a source of information in the State Department, or whether he gave the basis for the figures he cited. Or were they simply his own estimates?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is the statement of a gentleman who is a diplomatic writer for the New York Times, and he has a reputation for veracity and reliability, and many of his fellow reporters complain that he has special access to information in the State Department. That is all I know about the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. I see.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, there is no reason to disbelieve that the true cost of this program would be at least \$5,000,000,000 a year. We are already hearing about proposed loans to such countries as Korea and China. The new doctrine would seem to be an invitation to any regime that wants to call itself anti-Soviet to blackmail us for help.

The five billion or more dollars a year that this new policy might cost us would be in addition to the some \$6,000,000,000 provided for international obligations in the current budget.

Mr. President, a very revealing article has appeared in the United States News, the same publication from which I have quoted earlier this afternoon. I should like to have this article printed at this point in the RECORD, for it states the various countries we are expected to help. Of course, the United States News is a highly conservative organ which is circulated mostly among members of the business community. The article gives us a very good idea of what is behind this move and what its implications are.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW WE'LL GUARD WORLD AREAS WHERE THE BRITISH PULL BACK—DOLLARS, EXPERTS, AND WEAPONS FOR KEY COUNTRIES IN RUSSIA'S PATH—COSTS AND LACK OF POLITICAL EXPERIENCE AS OBSTACLES TO SHOULDERING LOAD EVERYWHERE

If the United States, as planned, takes over from the British in Greece, results that follow will gradually be felt over much of the world.

Dollars, in that event, will be used in Greece on a rather lavish scale to supply food, to restore currency values, to underwrite imports, to restore a basis for orderly trade. As much as \$250,000,000 may be poured into Greece in the year ahead.

United States troops, at least initially, will not be provided to put down resistance to the established government.

Military supplies will be furnished on a moderate scale at first.

Experts, advisers on currency problems, trade problems, industrial problems, will be supplied to guide the expenditure and investment of dollars.

That is the broad pattern of policy as it is shaped for Greece, subject to approval by Congress. Greece, however, is just a small

guinea pig for experiments in policy that then may be applied more widely, with dollars as the spearhead of a venture aimed at moving in as the British pull out of world commitments. At the very least, the United States Navy will be called on to guard the security of the world's oceans—a job that Britain once had.

Britain, running at a heavy loss in her world business, is withdrawing from unprofitable ventures and putting it up to the United States to take her place. The alternative is to let some situations go by default to groups that might be tied to Russia.

In the event that Congress agrees to shoulder British obligations in Greece, including some tough problems, other decisions will follow.

Turkey is second in line to get aid. If Greece falls into the Russian sphere, Turkey and the Dardanelles will be outflanked by the Soviets. In any event, Turkey's position is as much endangered by Russia as that of Greece. Thus, if Greece is helped in her effort to remain outside the Russian orbit, Turkey will be in a position to insist upon aid too.

A Turkish army of nearly 600,000 men stands ready to defend the Dardanelles—the gateway from the Black Sea to the Aegean and Mediterranean that Russia insists should be under her dominance. A recent secret White House conference dealt more with the problems of Turkey, now that British support is about to be withdrawn, than with those of Greece. The Turkish Government wants large-scale aid in the form of military supplies, and maybe dollar loans.

Palestine comes next. In Palestine, the British are involved in a situation that is requiring 100,000 British troops to manage. Britain is indicating to this Government that she may be forced to shift some of the responsibility for that area to the United States, if not the United Nations.

Any move by the United States to take over from Britain would probably involve large loans to Arab states to quiet opposition to large-scale Jewish immigration.

Egypt already is being turned loose by Britain. If Palestine is given up by the British, if Greece slips into the Russian sphere, and Turkey does the same, the effective defense of the whole eastern Mediterranean is lost, and the Suez Canal outlet to the Indian Ocean is jeopardized.

Iraq, Iran, Saudi Arabia, in that event, become major problems. United States oil companies have rights to vast oil reserves in this region, reserves that are expected to exceed those in the United States itself and to represent some 42 percent of the world's oil resources. A \$100,000,000 United States investment in a pipe line to carry Saudi Arabian oil to the Mediterranean is agreed upon.

Oil in this area is regarded as a major United States war resource, and its defense is viewed as important. Russia, with only 9 percent of the world's oil resources, is trying to get a foothold here. Whoever controls the eastern Mediterranean can dominate ready accessibility to this oil area, which accounts for the fact that the United States Navy, even now, is maintaining a fleet of three cruisers and six destroyers in the Mediterranean.

Basically, the foreign policy of the United States, as it has evolved, calls for resistance to expansion of Russian influence wherever that influence is exerted. Britain, to date, has cooperated in that policy despite the cost. The British, however, are seriously squeezed financially and are letting this country know that it will have to assume much more of the world burden or accept a further expansion of influence by Russia.

ECHOES

This means that the policy decision the United States makes with regard to taking over British commitments will have its repercussion over much of the world.

Italy, for example, is being held together now only by large-scale aid from this country. Communist influences in Italy are growing. The Russian sphere extends now to Yugoslavia and Albania, across the Adriatic from Italy. If United States policy is to stop the expansion of Russia's sphere, Italy will be in a position to demand new loans, more aid, further United States intervention as a condition of more resistance to Communist influence.

France will call for continued help. The French already have had large United States dollar loans. They are applying for a \$500,000,000 advance from the World Bank when that institution starts to function. Communist Party representatives now serve in the French Cabinet and their presence inclines the United States to be liberal in dollar advances to try to bolster the French economy and thereby avoid incentive to further Communist Party gains.

Germany is to be an increasing burden on the United States under the policy line now being proposed. The British are letting this Government know that they are not able to match the United States funds that Herbert Hoover has suggested as a minimum to provide a food dole to the German people. In a merger of British and American zones in Germany, the United States is taking over the major expense of sustaining a minimum diet for Germans of both zones. It will not be surprising if the United States soon is given the task of supplying troops to carry out more occupational duties in the British zone.

EASTERN PROBLEM

It is the same story on the other side of the world, where the United States undertook the burden of stabilization from the start:

In Japan, United States food and United States dollars are being spent on a large scale to try to bolster and rebuild Japan along a non-Communist line. General of the Army Douglas MacArthur warns that these expenses may increase, not lessen, in the period ahead.

In China, this country already has poured in large amounts of money, relief supplies, and surplus Army material, but now is holding back, temporarily at least, and accepting the chance of an overthrow by Chinese Communists. That is one situation where the cost of supporting the established Government is regarded as being too high for the returns.

In the Philippines, where rebels hold big areas, the United States may be called upon to resume some of its former responsibility, if the regime of President Manuel Roxas proves too weak to govern.

In India, Indochina, Indonesia, the British, French, and Dutch are unable to maintain their former authority, and the job of preserving order may be passed to the United States if order is to be preserved.

What the United States is up against all over the world is the fact that the British Empire is breaking apart at a time when Europe and Asia both are in chaos. The French and Dutch Empires are cracking, too. Immediate decisions to be made by the United States concern Greece and Turkey, but the emergencies in those countries are only samples of what is happening in many widely scattered parts of the world.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the Turkey-Greece proposal means, for one thing, an increasingly crushing tax load for the American people. For the most part, our money would be spent unproductively, for we would largely be—in Mr. Reston's words—"buying security by arming mercenaries to fight communism."

We will also have to maintain armed forces sufficient to police a large part of

the world. This will certainly require, among other things, a drastic cutting down of the Federal Government's expenditures on public health, social services, education, and, let me add, reclamation projects, flood control, and highways. Some newspapers have already pointed out editorially that it may be necessary to cut down on veterans' benefits as a result of the proposed loans for Greece and Turkey and what will follow.

But this is not all. We ought to be building a peace economy. But this program bids fair to set off an artificial boom which will result in a major depression.

The very conservative business writer of the New York Times, Russell Porter, writing in support of what he called the Pax Americana, on March 16 nonetheless admitted that the result of the new State Department policy may be to step up inflationary pressures. If the tendency to inflation continues, he said, "it may destroy the country's hopes of controlling the post-war boom well enough to keep it from eventually collapsing in a major depression, with widespread business failures and mass unemployment."

So the new imperialism may, according to Mr. Porter, very well end in the break-down of free enterprise and democracy and the very triumph of totalitarianism that we are seeking to forestall.

This is only one type of problem raised by the State Department's proposals.

Mr. President, these implications are of enormous importance, and they cannot be ignored. We must take the time to inform ourselves and the people back home about them, and must consider these factors in making our decision.

There is another aspect of this so-called crisis which I should like to discuss. It is being widely said that Congress cannot turn down the Greek and Turkish recommendations without creating the appearance of a dangerous division of American opinion at a crucial point in history. The New York Times correspondent, James Reston, pointed out, March 19:

The one fact that is generally stressed by both the Congressmen and the officials of the executive branch is that Congress does not now have an absolutely free choice.

I say, Mr. President, that this raises the most serious question as to why the whole business was precipitated in this manner in the first place.

The State Department claims that the British informed them only at the end of February that Britain could not support Greece after March 31. It has been widely reported, however, that the State Department was informed about the proposed British withdrawal as long ago as October 1946. The State Department has denied this. However, it can be assumed as certain that the British Government knew at a much earlier date than late February that it could not continue to support Greece. It is fair to assume, therefore, that the State Department was in fact informed much earlier.

The New York Times reports, to which I have already directed attention, state

clearly that the American Government has been kept informed of the Greek situation and British intentions there all along.

The New York Times on March 17 headlined a dispatch from Paris: "Europeans uneasy on new United States policy." The dispatch said that reaction in high places throughout Europe may surprise many Americans. The correspondent, Harold Callender, declared, on the basis of conversations with Frenchmen and other Europeans:

To a striking extent professional diplomatic quarters, and other non-Communist or anti-Communist quarters, echoed in an only slightly attenuated form the Moscow charge of a new and expanding American imperialism.

In Italy, too, there was an uneasy reaction from all parties. The Times reported from Rome, March 14, that the independent and moderate Italian press clearly reveals its anxiety lest President Truman's move should lead to complications that might involve Italy in war. The Times quoted Swedish papers as declaring that the President's speech has only served to increase the difficulties and deepen the disagreement between east and west.

Nor has the President's policy aroused enthusiasm in England, except from Winston Churchill and his friends. The New York Herald Tribune reported March 21 that Mr. Churchill speaks for a minority. According to the Tribune correspondent, Jack Tait:

The shots fired in the House (of Commons) at the Truman program appear to come from fear and suspicion of the United States rather than from love of Russia.

He reported that some members of Parliament see Americans as sinister planners, bent on propagating the capitalist system in Europe as opposed either to Russian communism or British socialism, and that others see the United States dragging Britain into a ghastly show-down war with Russia.

"Still others," he said, "shy away from American dominance in Greece on the grounds that it will not permit the evolution of a true people's government in that country. The United States is clearly associated with the forces of the right in the British mind."

The British paper, the Manchester Guardian, declared editorially:

One feels that, faced with the same situation, President Roosevelt would first have tried to do the same things through the United Nations by enlisting the support of other nations, including Russia if possible. Peace, the status quo, the integrity of nations—these are not exclusive American interests, but the interests of us all.

The New York Herald Tribune has reported that the most prevalent fear aroused in Britain by the Greece-Turkey program is that the United States is tending toward individual rather than collective action in international affairs. It is not only in England that this fear prevails. There has been overwhelming protest here in the United States, because people feel that we have bypassed the United Nations. As a result, it is now said that the United Nations may be informed about our action; it has

been informed since I prepared these remarks. Others are proposing statements or preambles to the bills stating that the proposed action does not violate the UN charter.

I find this, Mr. President, a strange idea of the United Nations. The United Nations was created not to be informed about actions taken by any one of its members in the sphere of international relations, but to decide itself whether action should be taken, particularly when a threat of war is involved.

There can be no doubt that the United Nations has adequate power to meet this crisis. Paragraph 1 of article 1 of the UN Charter defines the purposes of the United Nations, among other things, "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

Article 33 provides the several methods for settlement and adjudication of disputes and gives the Security Council authority, whenever it deems necessary, to call upon the parties to settle their disputes by such means.

Article 34 gives the Security Council authority to "investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security."

The questions of Greece and Turkey must be submitted to the United Nations so that the United Nations can itself decide what action should, or should not, be taken. If the problem is not submitted to the United Nations, no matter how much information we may choose to give that Organization, or how many preambles we may choose to write, the United Nations will have been weakened by our hands. Indeed, Mr. President, Mr. Trygve Lie himself, in his recent speech, was suggesting politely that the UN possibly should have the matter to consider.

Mr. President, we live in a perilous age. The atomic bomb threatens the entire earth with destruction. The people of the world must learn, and learn soon, to get along together. Our only hope is in international friendship and cooperation. Let us not deceive ourselves about that. Let us not delude ourselves with a false notion of security based upon arms superiority. Let us not believe—because none of our scientists believe—that the manufacture of the atomic bomb is a secret forever hidden from the view of scientists who do not work in United States laboratories.

Our last best hope, our only hope, Mr. President, is the United Nations. We must build the UN, and we must strengthen it until it becomes the world's great bulwark against men's warlike insanity. We must go further; we must give it the strength and sinews to enable it to prevent wars for all time, by developing the United Nations into a true world government, Mr. President. We

must make the United Nations a parliament of men, the legislature of a peaceful world. The United Nations has already proved its worth in settling disputes between nations. It has successfully settled disputes involving Iran, Syria, and Lebanon. We have every reason to be confident it can handle this situation also.

The problem of Greece and Turkey is clearly one for the United Nations. If we bypass the United Nations today, we have scuttled it just as surely as we scuttled the League of Nations by our refusal to join it after the last war.

The senior Senator from Florida and myself have introduced a resolution which recognizes the great relief needs of the Greek people, but would solve them through the operation of the machinery of the United Nations. I urge every one of my colleagues to give his close attention to that bill and to realize that it is not necessary to scuttle the United Nations to achieve the relief of the Greek people. It is possible to give the United Nations its great opportunity to show its effectiveness. When this body votes on the program for Greece and Turkey, it will make a momentous decision. It will decide whether the old system of unilateral power politics is to be continued to its ultimate hopeless end, or whether it is to be replaced by the orderly processes of an international body. It will decide whether the old and vicious system of imperialism is forever dead, or whether this great and free country will take over the loathsome burdens of the dying British Empire.

I have made very strenuous attempts during the last several weeks to learn what public opinion is on this matter. I have talked to people wherever I went. I have sought out dozens of men and women who visited Greece on relief and journalistic missions. I have closely read the public opinion polls, and I have read the mail which has come in from my own and other States. I have decided, Mr. President, that the American people are in accord with the views I have set forth here today. The public does not wish to hide its head in the sand, it does not wish to return to isolationism, and finally, the public is willing to make generous sacrifices for reasonable relief needs, but it wants to be sure the money is prudently spent by honest and efficient agents, and not by a corrupt king.

The resolution introduced by the senior Senator from Florida and myself meets exactly these requirements. It is a genuine attempt to protect American interests and to preserve and to protect the people of Greece, to aid them.

I fully realize the necessity of the United Nations taking action. I submit that it is the safest and most effective policy to protect democracy and world peace.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I would like to have inserted in the RECORD an article from today's Cincinnati Enquirer under the headline "Chinese 'terrorist' troops killed 5,000 in attempting to halt Formosa rebellion; oppression is worst ever, editor avers."

XCH—182

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINESE "TERRORIST" TROOPS KILLED 5,000 IN ATTEMPTING TO HALT FORMOSA REBELLION; OPPRESSION IS WORST EVER, EDITOR SAYS

SHANGHAI, March 30.—John W. Powell declared today in an article in his newspaper, China Weekly Review, that Chinese troops sent to Formosa to quell riots which started there February 28, had perpetrated "some of the most unimaginable atrocities."

Powell, son of the late famed editor, J. B. Powell, wrote that a conservative estimate placed the number of Formosans killed at 5,000, with thousands more imprisoned. He has newly returned from a visit to Formosa.

So far as is known, Powell is the only American correspondent who has succeeded in going to and returning from the big island province off China's east coast since rioting began.

No immediate comment was forthcoming from Chinese Government sources, but the Government previously had depreciated the extent of the scantily reported Formosan disorders.

On March 14, Peng Hsueh-Pei, Chinese Minister of Information, told foreign newsmen in Nanking that the Formosan "incident will soon be closed." He declined to assist reporters in going there, saying that the government was "too busy" to look after them.

On March 10 a Formosan delegation arrived in Nanking and charged that authorities up to that time had killed 3,000 to 4,000 Formosans. Pro-Government Chinese press reports on the first day had placed the death toll at 500.

Pro-Government sources and the Formosans agreed that the Government's monopoly system in various businesses, particularly tobacco, had touched off what the Chinese Central News Agency—an official Government organ—said was open and widespread rebellion.

Powell added the disorders culminated a year and a half of flagrant Chinese misrule which he said had squeezed and oppressed the Formosans far worse than when they were ruled by the Japanese.

China lost Formosa in 1895; it was restored to her in 1945 after the Japanese surrender.

Powell's article, entitled "Blood Bath in Taiwan," said the administration of Gov. Chen Yi had coupled trickery with a reign of terror which he said was probably unequalled in the history of Kuomin-tang China and thus had virtually suppressed the rebellion.

Powell wrote that the riots were preceded by extremely severe searches of shops and peddler stands by police who, he said, were trying to enforce new economic regulations which virtually abolished private trade. These regulations, he said, directly violated Central Government laws in China proper.

The proverbial last straw came on February 27, he declared, when police killed a 40-year-old woman in Taipei (Taihoku), the capital, when she protested seizure of her cigarette tray. He said a man died from a shot fired by another policeman into the crowd of onlookers.

Mr. TAYLOR. We turned Formosa back to the Government of Chiang Kai-shek, another of the supposed and so-called democracies that we are attempting to bolster round the world, and his Government is so corrupt, this newspaper says, that the Formosans were forced to rebel, and the most terrible atrocities in the history of China, a country noted for atrocities, are being perpetrated upon the people of Formosa with lend-lease weapons furnished by the United States.

In Greece, the very people who fought Adolf Hitler are being hunted down with guns furnished by us. I contend, Mr. President, we will not bring peace to the world, we will not build confidence in the United States, in the institution of democracy, by simply supporting every broken-down reactionary Fascist government in the world, simply because it happens to be opposed to communism.

EXHIBIT A

TOMORROW—FROM THE NATION'S CAPITAL—A
LOOK AHEAD
NEWSGRAM

It isn't to be so bad—this job of trying to run the world. It seems that somebody has to run it. Britain can't. Russia will, if United States doesn't.

War is not part of the job. A willingness to go to war if challenged, however, is part of it. War won't come if United States accepts idea of possible war.

War would come if United States let Russia go on picking off choice corners in the world; if this country backed away as Russia pushed out. Russia could get strong that way, as Hitler got strong, through fear by others. At some point it then would be a matter of fighting or losing by default with Russia strong.

War is far less likely with Russia checkmated; a long peace more likely.

Russia cannot, and will not, challenge a United States willing to fight. If Russia cannot go on picking off strategic bits of real estate without a fight she will pull back. If Russia is convinced that United States is ready to run the world if it must, then Russia will be interested in a functioning United Nations. In that way she could get a voice in what goes on. Otherwise she's out. If Russia is ready to stop her foolishness, the United Nations could function and United States in that way could let a world organization do more of the job.

That's the long and short of it.

United States is equipped to guide the world if that's what Russia forces.

A \$31,885,000,000 United States aid and development program is in the works. Most of that program has had Congress approval.

Capital equipment is to be supplied in big volume.

Food and clothing are to continue to pour out of United States.

Dollars, on loan, to be translated into goods, are supplied liberally by Government, and private capital for foreign investment soon is to be tapped.

Brains, engineering brains, financing brains, administrative brains, are to be exported in large quantities. Some military brains will go, too.

United States has about everything to offer if the outside world will cooperate. Big figures, big jobs no longer awe Americans. There is a \$341,000,000,000 investment already made in war, a \$31,885,000,000 postwar investment already either set or about to be set. United States couldn't pull back now if it wanted to.

Russia, by contrast, offers these things for export:

Revolution—a technique for Communist Party members to gain power.

Police to advise on terror and methods of dealing with opponents.

Requisition teams to drain away available supplies to Russia.

Against that background, these conclusions seem evident:

Europe, outside the Russian sphere, will be set up in business again.

Russian-dominated areas will continue in poverty, unless ready to join with the West in meeting terms of the plans for world co-operation.

Western Germany will be revived, either on a basis Russia now will be ready to accept, or independent of Russia. That will be settled in Moscow.

Japan probably will be revived, so people can go to work again.

Russia will either mend her ways or be isolated. Russian weakness at this time is profound. Internal strains are greater than at any other time in the experience of the regime. Industrial revival is far behind schedule. The poverty of Russian people is acute and growing, rather than being relieved.

Any idea that Russia, in the foreseeable future, could challenge this country in a military way, with any hope of success, is absurd.

What Russia has sought, however, is to gain strategic victories without fighting, to maneuver with fifth columns and political weapons against weak nations, hoping thereby to gain strength. United States is calling that game.

Cost of world leadership for United States need not be too high.

Loans make up \$20,774,000,000 of a \$31,885,000,000 program.

Private loans are to represent \$7,200,000,000 of that total.

Surplus property already paid for adds another \$5,760,000,000.

Relief is down for \$5,351,000,000, but more than half of that is already spent and not a new expense. The only funds not yet budgeted are \$950,000,000 for Turkey and Greece, for Germany and for Austria. That's \$950,000,000 in a \$37,500,000,000 budget. It isn't enough to upset the financial apple cart.

The idea is that United States industry soon will be making heavy investments in foreign industries. Industry of this country invested \$7,120,000,000 abroad after World War I, and, by 1940, had drawn income of \$7,428,000,000 on that investment. Plans now shaping don't concern only taxpayers.

Taxes need not be higher for the United States' venture in world leadership.

Tax reduction, in any event, is tied to the level of prosperity.

Prosperity levels will relate directly to United States postwar investment in world development, to the very large flow of dollars and goods abroad and to the large flow of foreign goods into United States.

A profit is possible, in the end, on United States venturing abroad.

Profit, however, will come only if United States can figure out how to let other nations pay the interest and principal on their loans by selling goods in the United States market. That is a problem that can be deferred during the period ahead when the big-scale investment will be in capital equipment to produce goods. New loans in this period will greatly exceed the scheduled payments.

What does seem more probable for United States is this:

Universal military training probably will become inevitable.

Training, at the start, is likely to be for 6 months, not a year.

Army-Navy-Air Forces size will remain far above prewar.

Merger of armed forces, in the end, will be forced by economy demands.

A double budget—a budget that will separate outright spending from loans, seems likely to be forced in years ahead, if lending operations grow.

Americans are to be forced to take an interest in the outside world. It is probable that careers related to service abroad will become as important in United States as they have been in Britain, where brains were exported on a big scale.

Congress cannot easily back out of commitments made and being made.

A Republican-Communist axis in United States seems very unlikely.

Isolationists now find themselves aligned with United States Communists, now find

that their position, politically, is not what it once was.

A crisis in far-off Greece, thus, is fixing United States postwar foreign policy.

George Marshall, United States Secretary of State, favored a show-down with Russia.

General Marshall balked at the idea of United States on the defensive, insisted that in peace as in war the one strategy that succeeds is an offensive strategy, a strategy that United States always has insisted upon. Idea that a weak Russia could go on pushing this country around simply didn't make sense to the Secretary.

Secretary Marshall is inclined to imagination and daring, not drift.

TREND OF AMERICAN BUSINESS

United States business is to be affected directly by United States decision to underwrite world rebuilding, to take leadership in reorganizing the world.

Dollars are to flow out faster on loan and as gifts.

Trade will be high and active wherever the dollars flow.

Price levels will tend to be supported by heavy world demand for many types of goods, sale of which will be financed by United States loans.

Tariffs will tend to come down to permit service on loans.

Taxes will remain relatively high to support the Military Establishment required to assure order in the world and to underwrite the loan program.

Businessmen will do well to get deeply interested in world trade, to find where they may fit into what obviously is to be an expanding field of United States interest and activity abroad. It's to be settled now that the flag will follow the dollar into the far reaches of many areas in the world.

What's happening now isn't something brand new for United States. This country went out on a big scale with loans abroad after the last war.

Private loans abroad after World War I totaled above \$11,000,000,000.

Government loans totaled another \$7,500,000,000.

That was an \$18,500,000,000 pump-priming program for the first postwar. It went sour when United States balked at taking full repayment in foreign goods. About all of the Government's loans were defaulted, and \$3,372,000,000 of principal was lost on private loans. Of private loans still unpaid at 1944's end 81.7 percent of European issues were in default, 60.7 percent of Latin-American, and 55.7 percent of far eastern. There was no default on loans to Canada.

United States after World War I provided dollars but no considered plan by which dollars could be repaid. Tariffs were raised, not lowered. Loans often were made for non-productive purposes. The end result was trouble.

Loans and gifts now projected for the world exceed \$31,000,000,000.

Machinery for lending this time is more elaborate, more studied.

A world bank, with some Government guaranty of returns on loans made by private investors, will direct the over-all program of investment.

A monetary fund will seek to establish some stability in currencies.

A United States Export-Import Bank will direct some Government investment.

A negotiated dollar loan is to help out the British.

This country at the same time is preparing to reduce tariffs, to get some of the wartime controls over trade removed, to set up an international trade organization within which broad trade policies can be set. If planning will straighten out the world, experience after World War II will differ from experience after World War I. That remains to be seen.

The fact of heavy pump priming through loans and gifts is very real.

Food will remain in heavy demand. United States agriculture is to be bolstered by heavy commitments to help feed the world out of 1947 crops.

Machinery will be in heavy demand. World Bank loans, other loans, and use of exchange earned in trade will be spent for United States machinery. It is becoming highly probable that Germany and Japan will be permitted to restore industry on a broader scale than indicated earlier.

Steel and other raw materials face big markets.

Farm machinery is to be in heavy demand. The same is true of autos. It is probable that business machines are to be sought after.

Engineering services will be expected from United States as countries set about to rebuild or to industrialize. Financial advisers may find big jobs, too.

Industry in United States, alone of all industry, is equipped to turn out the goods needed abroad in the volume needed to restore war damage. Russia as well as other nations must look to United States for the equipment that rebuilding requires. There isn't any question about a large export trade financed by loans. What is not so clear, however, is exactly how borrowing nations are to pay for what they buy when the time comes to get back on a cash basis.

Nothing that is happening changes the outlook for business in months ahead. There still is the prospect of a downward adjustment in prices and production.

Prices are out of line with one another. Living costs have outstripped income increases. Building costs have shot up to nearly prohibitive heights. It is to be necessary to restore some balance before prolonged prosperity.

A turn downward in many prices is likely to be apparent by or soon after midyear, with production to show some decline not much later.

A bottom in the corrective move probably will be reached in early 1948.

A new rise into the period of postwar prosperity probably will be under way by midyear, 1948, or soon after that time. A period of 12 to 15 months is likely to be required for any correction that occurs in this period.

Downward adjustment, roughly, will be around 20 percent.

Even so, activity in business, profits, incomes will remain very high by any prewar standards. There will not be a real depression at this stage in the broad turn of the business cycle.

Tax reduction is not likely to be upset seriously by world developments.

A tax cut of at least 10 percent still seems likely for 1947 income.

Taxes obviously are going to remain far higher than before the war even after there is a broad tax adjustment in 1948. When the major tax cutting of postwar is undertaken next year individuals will be favored, with corporations to get rather modest relief. Excises will be reduced substantially then.

A budget in balance at around \$41,300,000,000 is probable for this year.

A balanced budget at around \$35,000,000,000 is probable for next year, for the year that starts next July 1. That's about \$2,500,000,000 under the level that Mr. Truman estimated and represents probable savings.

A balance in this years budget will leave the Government \$2,300,000,000 better off than the President figured and will increase the prospect that tax reduction will be applied to 1947 individual incomes.

Corporations should notice that Treasury is insisting upon explanation when less than 70 percent of 1946 earnings are distributed as dividends.

Despite ambiguous statements, section 102 of the revenue act, requiring that earnings

retained in business be "reasonable," is to get closer application than in war years, is to be applied more definitely. Treasury interest is in forcing income into the hands of individuals where it can be taxed at the high prevailing rates, after first being taxed at the corporation tax rate.

Rent control is being killed, but almost surely will be revived in a modified form. Present controls die definitely on June 30.

Sugar rationing is to be extended, with prices controlled.

Building controls run through 1947, but very probably are to be modified before long. Builders are blaming the effort to allocate materials for many of their present troubles. Veterans' housing is as good as dead.

The economy is relatively free from controls at this time. Prices are continuing to move steadily higher in the postcontrol inflation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 931. An act to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act; and

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

As in legislative session,

The Secretary of the Senate reported that he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On March 29, 1947:

S. 918. An act to establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the Selective Service records, and for other purposes; and

On March 31, 1947:

S. 931. An act to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of David E. Lilienthal to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Connally	Green
Ball	Cooper	Gurney
Barkley	Cordon	Hatch
Bricker	Donnell	Hawkes
Brooks	Downey	Hayden
Buck	Dworshak	Hickenlooper
Bushfield	Eaton	Hill
Butler	Ellender	Hoey
Byrd	Ferguson	Holland
Cain	Flanders	Ives
Capper	Fulbright	Jenner
Chavez	George	Johnson, Colo.

Johnston, S. C.	Maybank	Smith
Kem	Millikin	Sparkman
Kilgore	Moore	Stewart
Knowland	Morse	Taft
Langer	Murray	Taylor
Lodge	Myers	Thomas, Okla.
Lucas	O'Connor	Thomas, Utah
McCarran	O'Daniel	Tobey
McCarthy	O'Mahoney	Tydings
McClellan	Overton	Umstead
McFarland	Pepper	Vandenberg
McGrath	Reed	Watkins
McKellar	Revercomb	Wherry
McMahon	Robertson, Va.	Wiley
Magnuson	Robertson, Wyo.	Williams
Malone	Russell	Wilson
Martin	Saltonstall	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to discuss primarily the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], to recommit the Atomic Energy Commission nominations to the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Before doing so I think I should say that I am not one of those who know all about atomic energy. I believe I read something about splitting the atom when I was a boy, but that was a long time ago.

The first I ever knew of the United States having a will to split the atom or to bring about the discovery of atomic energy was in 1941. I shall take the liberty of telling briefly about that experience.

In 1941 Mr. Stimson was Secretary of War. He had been Secretary of State in another administration. He called me on the telephone one morning and said, "I should like to come to see you in about an hour." I told him I would be delighted to see him. In about half an hour he called again and stated that there were two or three other Senators whom he wanted to see at the same time, and he wondered if I would meet with him and the other Senators in the Democratic caucus room so that we could talk about the same matter at the same time and save a great deal of time. I laughed and said jokingly, "Why is it that you want to meet in the Democratic caucus room?" He laughed a little at that; but in half an hour five of us met in the caucus room. There were: The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], whom I do not see present in the Chamber at the moment; the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who is not in the Chamber; the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]; and myself. At that time the Senator from Kentucky was the majority leader and the Senator from Maine was the minority leader.

After the usual formalities Secretary Stimson told us that he had a group of scientists working on a new proposal. He stated that they had been working for quite a while. He had obtained an appropriation the previous year, and he believed that those scientists would be able to discover the secret of atomic energy. Everyone laughed. I said, "I remember reading when I was a boy that 2,300 years ago Alexander the Great undertook to have Macedonian scientists discover the splitting of the atom." He said, "Yes; but I think we can succeed." Then I told him that I remem-

bered some very hard Latin which I learned when I was in college. Three or four hundred years after Alexander, Lucretius, a Latin poet, had had a great deal to say about the atom. Secretary Stimson said, "Yes." I said, "Everyone has been talking about it ever since. Scientists all over the world have been talking about discovering how to split the atom, and at the beginning of one of the greatest wars in history you talk about spending a large sum of money to split the atom."

He then made one of the best arguments in favor of following up that research that I have ever listened to in my life. I believe that the other Senators who heard him would say that he made a wonderful argument. The first one to be convinced was the Senator from Maine. The next one to be convinced was the Senator from Kentucky. The third one to be convinced was the Senator from New Hampshire; and the fourth was myself. At that time the Senator from New Hampshire was the ranking member of the minority on the Appropriations Committee and I was the acting chairman of the committee, and had been for some time. That was why we were invited to the conference. That was why we were given the information and consulted on the problem. Secretary Stimson wanted money. When I asked him how much money he wanted, he said he would like to have \$1,000,000,000 the first year, but that if we could not give him \$1,000,000,000, it would be necessary to have at least \$800,000,000.

I said, "Mr. Secretary, you swore all four of us to secrecy a while ago, and you told us that you swore the four Members of the House to whom you submitted the same information. For heaven's sake, how do you expect us to keep it a secret and get an appropriation of a billion dollars for this purpose through the Congress? We are going into a great war. There is no telling how much it will cost. If I should suggest an appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 for an unstated purpose, I know Members of the Senate so well that I know they will never agree to it."

He said, "We have that figured out." As I recall, he had already figured it out with the President, and perhaps one or two others. The appropriation was to be placed in several different proposals—covered up, so to speak—and it was believed that it would go through in the face of the great war. We placed most of it in the emergency fund for the President. I told Secretary Stimson that I would be willing to do that but that if any Senator asked me, when I had charge of the bill on the floor, what the billion-dollar appropriation was for, I would not be willing to agree to tell a falsehood about it. Secretary Stimson said he was sure that no inquiry would be made about it. I told him that I would stop the bill until I had discussed the question further with the executive department—principally with himself. He agreed.

The bill was introduced in the House, and it passed the House and came to the Senate. It was reported by the Senate committee and considered on the floor of

the Senate. Not a single Member of either House asked about the appropriation. We were not asked about it in committee, and we were not asked about it on the floor of the Senate.

The next year exactly the same thing occurred. There was an appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 the second year. With all the necessity for money in the third year we got by with an appropriation of \$600,000,000, as members of the Appropriations Committee will probably recall, although we did not even tell the members of the committee about it. The total appropriations were \$2,600,000,000.

Several years afterward, toward the close of the war, when the war with Germany was over, I ate ham for supper one night—we still call dinner supper in my part of the country—and could not sleep. I lay awake thinking about what we had done. We had spent \$2,600,000,000; the war with Germany was over, and we had not heard a word about the atomic bomb. I remembered that on that day one of the important political leaders of Tennessee, from Chattanooga, Tenn., had been in my office and wished to know whether I would run for the Senate again. I told him I did not know; that I thought probably I had been in the Senate long enough, but that if the people wanted me to remain in the Senate it would be all right with me. Then I began to think what effect that sort of a proposition would have on my Senatorial aspirations for the sixth time, and I came to the conclusion that if it were said that I, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, had joined in spending \$2,600,000,000 when a great war was going on, I need never expect to be again elected Senator from Tennessee.

I made up my mind that I would call Mr. Stimson the first thing next morning, which I did. I called him and asked him if he would see me, and he said he would. I said, "Will you be kind enough not to send someone to pin one of those big saucers on me?" We all remember the big identification "saucers," they used to pin on people who visited the Department.

He said at once he would meet me at the door, and he did. When we arrived at his office—it was up one flight of stairs, and we walked up—I told him what I wanted. He said, "Senator, by the strangest coincidence, yesterday I promised two gentlemen that I would not tell what the atomic-energy situation is at this time." I said, "Mr. Secretary, I wish you would get released from that promise." He said, "I will. I will see those two gentlemen today, and I will communicate with you before 12 o'clock tomorrow."

The next day I waited in my office for some word from Mr. Stimson. I waited until 5 minutes before 12. At that time I held the place which the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] now holds. Then I came here to open the Senate. About 15 minutes after I arrived here—to be exact, it was 17½ minutes, I recall—a page came to me and said that a military gentleman wished to see me in the Vice President's office. I went there, and there was the personal military secretary of the Secretary of War. He said he had

been delayed; that his car had got out of repair and it had delayed him a little while; that Mr. Stimson had taken a plane to New York at 10 o'clock and had instructed him to deliver a message to me. I said, "All right. What is the message?" He said, "It is in two parts. Mr. Stimson told me to tell you the first part. He has received permission from the two gentlemen who were in the secret to give you the first part of it. He said that if you insisted, I was to give you the second part, but that if you did not insist, I was not to give you the second part."

I said, "I want to hear the first part, and then I can tell you whether I want to hear the second part."

Thereupon he proceeded to tell me that the atomic bomb was one of the greatest successes in the world, far surpassing anything they ever believed would take place. He said they had bought three towns, if I remember correctly. I would have to go back to the record in order to be accurate about it, but that is my recollection; possibly the Senator from New Mexico could tell us. My recollection is that he said, "Senator, we have bought three towns and an enormous quantity of land. We have constructed experimental stations and have tried out the bomb, first removing every living human being and every tame animal and as many of the wild animals as possible. We have tried the bomb, and it has been an entire success, and we shall use it in this war."

I said, "And then what?" He said, "That is the second part, and I cannot tell you that unless you insist." I said, "I am afraid I shall have to insist, because I should like to know." He said, "There are three planes"—he told me what kind they were, but I have forgotten—"at this very moment on their way to Japan, loaded with atomic bombs, and we are expecting to hear from them at any time. The Secretary told me to inform you that if I told you this part of it he would let you know as soon as he heard from those bombs. He believes that they are going to work a great miracle."

As I recall—my memory is not so good as it was when I was younger—that very night, as I recall, before 8 or 9 o'clock, the whole world knew what had been done with those bombs. They cost us \$2,600,000,000; indeed, much more than that. Of course we are all proud of them.

I think that was the best-kept secret I ever heard of in my life. There were four men in the House and four in the Senate who knew about it. I doubt that there were many others besides the executive officers in charge. General Groves had charge. It was under his general management, control and operation that the great success came of it.

I wish to be perfectly frank and say that I never was more astonished in all my days—and they have been many—than when I learned that General Groves had been relieved of that position, that many of the men who had brought about this great discovery had been dismissed and set aside, and that people who knew absolutely nothing about it and had never heard of it before, as the testimony

shows, had been appointed in their places.

We have taken a great deal of proof. On Friday the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], entered a motion to recommit these nominations to the committee, and he gave magnificent reasons for taking that action. They were vital reasons. Statements were made by him which should be answered before the Senate consents to the nominations, because, under the Constitution, in the matter of appointments the power of the Senate is not confined to a mere formal authority, as some people sometimes seem to think, but is equal with that of the Executive.

The newspapers have described me lately as a man who opposes all nominations. I shall in a moment state what my record is in that regard. I have not examined the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in detail about it; but I have examined my memory to the best of my ability. I have been here through seven administrations. I first came here in the Taft administration; I served through the Wilson administration, through the Harding administration, through the Coolidge administration, through the Hoover administration, through the Roosevelt administration, and thus far in the Truman administration; and this is only the second nomination which I have disapproved in all that time—nearly 31 years.

The first was the nomination of Aubrey Williams, 2 years ago. Mr. Williams came from Tennessee, too. My colleague and I declined to endorse his appointment. It was sent to the Senate under the administration of Mr. Roosevelt. We declined to support that nomination. All the newspapers said there was nothing whatever wrong with Mr. Williams; but he belonged to at least one and possibly two Communist-front organizations and was associated with Communists all the time. On that ground, my colleague and I, who were familiar with the facts, just as we are familiar with the facts in the case now before the Senate, opposed the nomination of Mr. Williams. We did so on the ground of his Communist leanings. We did not know whether he was a Communist; we had no evidence of his actual membership in the Communist Party. If he was a Communist, he kept it secret, just as Mr. Lillenthal is keeping it secret if he is a Communist. We do not know that Mr. Lillenthal is a Communist; we have no papers which show that he is.

Mr. President, in a few minutes I shall present to the Senate some of the details relative to the action taken by the Senate on the nomination of Mr. Williams. Forty of the present Members of the Senate were Members of this body 2 years ago when the Senate voted on the nomination of Mr. Williams. Those 40 Senators voted against confirmation of his nomination, because he was associated with Communists. I was one of those 40 Senators. My colleague from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] was another of them, and most of the Senators I see around me now also belonged to that group.

Mr. President, the case against Mr. Lillenthal is a much stronger one, as will be developed, than the case against Mr. Williams was. Mr. Williams had been a school teacher, as I recall; but he was a very enthusiastic Communist-front organization man. His nomination was rejected by the Senate by a very large majority. As I recall, approximately 56 Senators voted against confirmation of his nomination.

Until the nominations now pending came to the Senate, the nomination of Mr. Williams was the only one I ever voted against during seven administrations, four of them Republican and three of them Democratic. That is why I was so astonished when, a short time ago, the newspapers charged me with being such a terrible man.

As I have said, the first thing we are to consider is the motion which has been made by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. I am heartily in favor of having the Senate adopt that motion and send these Atomic Energy Commission nominations back to the committee, for the purpose of having the committee take and hear additional proof. Briefly, I shall give my reasons for supporting the motion of the junior Senator from Ohio.

First, Mr. President, it was shown in the main hearings—I do not believe this matter has been discussed as yet—that during 1930, Mr. Lillenthal received from the Commerce Clearing House, an organization of public utilities in Chicago, Ill., approximately \$20,000 a year—to be exact, according to the figures it was \$20,020—and he continued to receive that sum until 1931, when Gov. Philip La Follette, of Wisconsin, offered him a position on the Wisconsin Railroad Commission, as it was then called—since known as the Wisconsin Public Service Commission. His salary from the Commerce Clearing House was then reduced to \$14,500. Mr. Lillenthal continued in that place during the year 1931 and at least a portion of 1932.

From February 12, 1931, until August 27, 1932, a period of 18 months and 15 days, he received \$5,000 a year from the State of Wisconsin, and at the same time he received from the Commerce Clearing House, of Chicago, Ill., \$14,500 a year, contrary to the plain terms of the Wisconsin statute. A little later I shall show that by receiving such salary from the Commerce Clearing House at the same time that he was a member of the Wisconsin Railroad Commission, he vacated the office with the Wisconsin Commission, for the Wisconsin statute provided that such would be the case if a member of the commission received a salary from any other organization, regardless of whether it was the right kind of an organization or the wrong kind.

Mr. President, I asked the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to ask the Treasury Department what income tax Mr. Lillenthal paid during the years 1931 and 1932. By the way, Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire is one of my dearest friends; even if he is a Republican, he is one of the finest men I ever saw in my life. I have served with him ever since he has

been in the Senate, and I have enjoyed my service with him. So I asked him to ask the Treasury Department what income tax Mr. Lillenthal paid during 1931 and 1932. I never had any more doubt that the Treasury Department would send that information to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee than I had that I was living at the time. That would be the most natural thing in the world; why should the Treasury Department withhold such information from the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee? Nevertheless, Mr. President, the Treasury Department refused to give him that information. By all means, the committee considering the nomination of Mr. Lillenthal should have that information. Mr. Lillenthal has been nominated for appointment to what may be the most powerful office ever created, and yet we find that in Chicago, Ill., and in Madison, Wis., he was holding two jobs, in violation of law. One of them—the one in Wisconsin—was for the control and management of the power companies, the railroads, and other public utilities, whereas in Chicago, Ill., the job he held was that of editor of the Public Utilities and Carriers Service, for the Commerce Clearing House, and in that connection he was supposed to obtain all the information he could which would be beneficial to the private utilities and send it to them.

To that extent, he was serving two masters with opposing interests. All my colleagues present who are lawyers will recognize that it is just the same as a lawyer taking employment on both sides of a lawsuit. Is there anyone here who can think of anything different? Here is a man who was a member of the commission to regulate public utilities in Wisconsin, and in Chicago, nearby, he had this other office.

While I am speaking of that, I will tell the Senate how I got this evidence.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will wait for a moment, I shall yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. The witness on the stand was not my witness. When I got through my proof, this lovely little woman was sitting there, and she was called by the chairman of the committee.

I digress, Mr. Chairman, to say that a Senator, I believe the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], paid the chairman of the committee a very high compliment and expressed very high praise of him this morning for his frankness and fairness in conducting the hearing, and I wish to join in that praise.

The chairman, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], had his papers out on his desk in front of him, and he said, "I do not seem to find my memorandum about you, my dear lady. Have you a memorandum?"

This was the substance of what was said. If I make a mistake, I hope the Senator from Iowa will correct me, because I do not wish to make any mistake in what I say.

This lady replied, "Yes, I have a memorandum." The chairman said, "Will you proceed to read it?" To my utter astonishment, more than astonishment, the little lady said, "I was born in St. Joseph, Mo., and moved to St. Louis in 1926"—or 1927. "In 1928 I moved to Chicago, and I saw a notice somewhere that Mr. Lillenthal desired a stenographer, and I went to his office. He treated me very nicely, talked to me a while, and said he thought I would suit. Thereupon he offered me \$24 a week, and I accepted. When I went there I found he had employed another young lady, who stayed only a few days, and I took her place. He also employed a Mr. Booth at \$28 a week, and Mr. Joseph C. Swidler"—incidentally, now the general counsel of the TVA—"at \$17.50 a week."

Mrs. Leitzell got about \$100 a month, Mr. Booth a little less than \$125 a month, or about that, and Mr. Swidler \$71.75 a month. Remember, Senators, those were hard times. The big salaries paid now were not being paid at that time. At all events, this lady went on to say that she found that Mr. Lillenthal was a shorthand man, that he wrote in shorthand, and she soon found that she could read his shorthand and he could read hers. She stayed with him as long as he remained there.

She then said—a most remarkable thing—that on February 5, 1931, he came to her and told her that he had been offered by Gov. Phil La Follette a position as a member of the Railroad Commission of Wisconsin, afterward the Utilities Commission, and he said, "Now, I want you to keep this a very, very grave secret. I do not want to be known as having any interest in this business down here. I want you to keep it a secret. I want you to keep the books, I want you to write the checks. I want you to do everything that I could do here."

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator care to yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot yield just now. I will have to ask the Senator to wait a little while. I shall yield to him later.

She stated that he said, "I want you to look after things here." And she did, and I have no doubt did it well. She gave those figures and names, and I want to say that they made a big impression on me, and I began to look into the matter immediately, and sent telegrams to Wisconsin and Chicago to find out what the facts were, whether she was correct or not.

The next morning the most remarkable thing occurred. When I looked at the record, I found that the three names—of Mr. Booth, Mrs. Leitzell, and Mr. Swidler—and their salaries, were not in the record. I immediately called the stenographer and directed his attention to it. He said no, that he never received them; he was very mysterious about it.

I telegraphed Mrs. Leitzell, and I have the telegram somewhere in my records here. She did not remember about it. So the next day, I believe it was, or perhaps 2 or 3 days afterwards, I rose and called the attention of the committee to the matter. I recalled to the chairman having heard the names and heard the

salaries, the remarkably low salaries that Mr. Lillenthal was paying. Incidentally, Mr. Lillenthal was getting \$20,000 a year—remember that—and these three people were getting, one \$125 a month, another \$100 a month, and the other \$71.75 a month.

At any rate, I asked unanimous consent that the record be corrected. The chairman put the motion, and it was agreed to.

Mr. Lillenthal did not go on the stand to deny anything. The case closed without Mr. Lillenthal going on the stand. But in fairness and justice I should say that after the committee got together they called Mr. Lillenthal before the committee and he produced an agreement with the Commerce Clearing House, and the agreement showed exactly what the facts were. They did not differ from what had been stated. The only thing Mr. Lillenthal did to deny those facts was to say that he did not remember about having told this lady to keep the matter secret. He spoke very highly of Mrs. Leitzell.

I tried to get Mrs. Leitzell on the telephone, and to have her appear before the committee again, but could not do so. What happened I do not know. I am merely giving the Senate the facts exactly as they occurred.

Someone may ask, how does that affect the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]? It affects it in the most direct way in the world. If Lillenthal received \$20,000 in 1931 and 1932, the Internal Revenue Bureau will have a memorandum of that fact, and of what tax he paid.

Here were competing organizations, one regulating railroads, telephones, and telegraph companies, the other being regulated, and if he was drawing salaries from both sides, one a salary on which he had to pay taxes, that ought to be examined into, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] ought to have the matter in his hands so that he can ask the Treasury Department for the tax files. They have refused to furnish them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I promised to yield to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES].

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. I wanted to inquire of the Senator about when the Senator from New Hampshire asked the Treasury Department for the information concerning the tax returns. Was it before the hearing was concluded, or afterward?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was just a few days ago. It was, I think, one day last week.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to ask the Senator another question, because I think what the Senator is saying is extremely important. I think the statement he has made about failure of the minutes or record of the committee meeting to contain certain facts brought out before the committee is very important.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, I did not go that far. I only said that something was left out.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator stated that something was left out which should not have been omitted.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say to the Senator that the chairman of the committee is not responsible for it in any way. No man ever acted with greater fairness.

Mr. HAWKES. I want to say to the Senator that two or three times something has been left out in committee hearings in which I have been participating, and I am beginning to be very careful to check anything that comes out in a committee, when I am present. It is very important to the Senate to know that the records of the Senate are accurate, and are full and complete.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. I shall not now refer further to that angle of the matter, but at this very time I am making some investigations myself along that line. I now want to ask the distinguished Senator what reason, if any, did the Treasury give for not divulging the figures of Mr. Lillenthal's income?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Treasury said they were executive matters which ought to be kept secret.

Mr. HAWKES. Why should the amount of Mr. Lillenthal's income be any more secret than the amount of the income of anyone else?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not have the letter. The Senator from New Hampshire had it. He will be here tomorrow.

Mr. HAWKES. Why should Mr. Lillenthal's income be any more secret than mine?

Mr. McKELLAR. It ought not to be.

Mr. HAWKES. Mine has been banned all over the United States for 15 years. Why should Mr. Lillenthal have any more secrecy about his income, on which he pays his tax, than any other citizen of the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator another question, because I am very deeply interested in this question and my only interest is the welfare of the people of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my only interest, notwithstanding what others may say.

Mr. HAWKES. I believe that, sincerely, regardless of what anybody else may have said about the Senator. I believe sincerely what the Senator has just said.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my only interest.

Mr. HAWKES. I believe the Senator is a great American, trying to do his duty. I should like to ask him this question: If he or I had been nominated for this important post, and the American people, or any substantial number of Members of the Senate, wanted to know anything about our private affairs, our income, or anything else, does not the Senator think that we would not only welcome an investigation, but would demand it? I know what I would do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should at least invite it, and I expect, if it were necessary, I would certainly demand it.

Mr. HAWKES. I want to say to the distinguished Senator, that I would not only welcome it, and invite it, but I would demand it. I would not want to go into that great office under any cloud before the American people; and now there certainly is a cloud. Regardless of whether the nominee is confirmed or not, he is under a very great cloud, and that cloud is evidenced in my office by letters from the finest people in the United States. There are some on both sides. Some of my very dearest friends are strongly in favor of the confirmation of Mr. Lillenthal's nomination, and there are some of the finest men in the United States who are just as strongly on the other side. I say to the Senator from Tennessee that if I were in Mr. Lillenthal's place, I would be begging and demanding that I be investigated by the FBI, that everything about my life be laid open to the Senate of the United States and to the people of the United States. It seems to me that Mr. Lillenthal should feel the same way, so that in entering upon the office he could not well be accused, as otherwise he might be, of many things for which he is not responsible. I would want to go into that office with clean hands, after a thorough investigation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to ask the Senator just one more question. Has the Senator or the committee thought of asking Mr. Lillenthal about how much he received and how much income tax he paid, and what he reported to the Government? I do not think the Senator would fail to get the facts, particularly if he asked for them under oath.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know of any such investigation being made.

Mr. HAWKES. I think it should be asked for. I thank the Senator very much for yielding.

Mr. McKELLAR. And I thank the Senator, too.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Despite the intensity of feeling of the Senator from Tennessee in this matter, I still—

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator could save a great deal of time if he would ask the question and not talk about the Senator from Tennessee. The Senator got that out of newspapers. I think he had better leave it there.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator will permit me, I was going to compliment him by saying that I know—

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not need a compliment.

Mr. McMAHON. I know the Senator would want to be fair enough to put into the RECORD at this point a telegram which was sent by former Governor La Follette to the committee, in which the former Governor comments on the charge that was made—

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, I am going to have that in the RECORD, but not at this point. I have it in my speech. I would not miss Governor La Follette for anything.

Mr. McMAHON. In which he entirely denies any improper conduct.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, no; I will let the Senator pass on it for himself.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator yield further, while I read the telegram?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I will not yield to get into that kind of argument.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank the Senator. I think in fairness it should be clearly brought out at this point that this Commerce Clearing House or Information Service which the able Senator from Tennessee has mentioned was a publication house which put out information relative to public utilities, as to rates, and so forth. The testimony shows that this information was also made use of by State regulatory bodies, as well as being useful to attorneys who practiced before commissions, and by public utilities themselves. I am sure the Senator would not want the record to stand in such a way that the impression might be created that Mr. Lillenthal was serving on the commission, on one side, and then was serving private utility companies as such on the other, because that is not the type of organization this Commerce Clearing House was.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is entirely mistaken about it. If he will look into the hearings, he will find that there is no such record there. This concern was employed by the Community Service of Chicago to get everything, to conduct research work. Lillenthal was a research man, and he was to get everything he could find that was beneficial to the private utilities, and send it to them. I have been told—it is not in the record, and I do not know whether I ought to say anything about things that are not in the record, but I have been told that they raised funds to pay his salary, saying that he was in a place of great importance in Wisconsin, and in that way would be in a better position to do greater good for the private utilities. I feel as though I ought to say that, because it has been so often repeated.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I think it should be pointed out at this juncture in the debate that the Wisconsin statute prohibited Mr. Lillenthal from receiving remuneration from private employment while he was serving as a member of that commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. I was going to read the statute a little later, but it is perfectly true, as my colleague says, that there was such a statute. When he took the oath as railroad commissioner in Chicago, he had to hold up his hand to high heaven and swear on pain of losing the office, that he was engaged in no other business. The statute specifically provides that the office shall become vacant if the occupant holds any other position, regardless of whether or not it is an antagonistic position. At that time he was not allowed to go into any other business in Wisconsin.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield, but will the Senator please limit himself to asking a question at the present time?

Mr. LUCAS. I was interested in a statement made by the Senator from Tennessee with respect to the lady who appeared and gave certain testimony. Does the evidence disclose how she happened to come before the committee? Was she subpoenaed by the committee, or how was it she came before the committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not recall. I never saw her before that time. She was not my witness. I thought that at last Mr. Lillenthal was going to produce a witness who knew him, to testify as to his good character. I remember saying to the one sitting next to me, "Well, at last we will get a good character witness," because the lady had a good face. She was rather good looking, too. I said, "We will at last get a good character witness by someone who actually knows Mr. Lillenthal." But instead of being a character witness she was, to my utter astonishment, a very different kind of witness.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator simply ask a question and let me proceed with my statement? I want to make a little progress before the Senate recesses.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator left me in doubt as to how the witness happened to be before the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know. The Senator will have to ask those in charge of Mr. Lillenthal's campaign.

Mr. LUCAS. I wanted to know at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the Senator investigate that subject. I will help him investigate it, and I shall be glad if the Senator will impart to me the knowledge he has gained if he finds how the lady came to appear before the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought the Senator from Tennessee investigated everything so thoroughly that he would not overlook the reason for a female witness appearing before the committee. I was simply trying to find how it was she happened to be there.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I did not investigate that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he resumes his statement?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator said he had heard that certain utilities had accepted the service provided by Mr. Lillenthal's organization because of the powerful position of Mr. Lillenthal. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there anything in the record to show that his organization solicited such accounts?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir; not in the record. I must be fair about that matter. Such a thing is not in the record, but the implication is very strong.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield for a question only.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask a question at this point because I think what I have in mind fits into the record here.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Tennessee inquired of Mr. Lillenthal, as appears on page 814 of the record:

You were working for the public utilities in the first place, and you were working for Wisconsin as the commissioner of utilities in Wisconsin, which was entirely contrary in character, was it not?

Mr. LILLENTHAL. No, Senator.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Lillenthal, might I ask a question at that point?

As a matter of fact, these reports that were put out were subscribed to and are of value to public-utility commissions all over the country, as well as to public utilities themselves, or to attorneys who practiced public-utility law; is that not so?

Mr. LILLENTHAL. Yes, Senator; they were widely used by State and local public officials concerned with utilities.

Senator KNOWLAND. In regulating?

Mr. LILLENTHAL. Regulatory matters; that is right.

Mr. McKELLAR. I presume that is about as good an explanation as any man who was caught in that sort of situation, a lawyer who was on both sides of the case, could make. I take off my hat to Mr. Lillenthal for being able to make so good an explanation under very difficult circumstances.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] on Friday showed that Mr. Lillenthal and his associates in the TVA in 1934 formed a cooperative corporation in Tennessee. The statement made by the Senator from Delaware was that Mr. Lillenthal induced the State of Tennessee to ask the Federal Government for \$300,000 of FERA money, that is, Federal Emergency Relief money, and then he and his associates incorporated a cooperative enterprise. By the way, that information, furnished by the Senator from Delaware, came as a great surprise to me. I thought I had fairly well kept up with what occurred in Tennessee, but I am frank to admit that I knew nothing about this matter, and I have been trying to find what the facts are ever since.

Mr. President, I think the Senator from Delaware has rendered a great service in securing the facts concerning this corporation. I have taken the matter up with individuals in Tennessee by telephone and telegraph today, and I shall read a telegram sent to me by Mr. Walter Armstrong, who is one of the best lawyers in Tennessee, or anywhere else in the country. I believe some Senators present know Mr. Armstrong. He is a former president of the American Bar Association; a man of the highest legal ability. I asked him about the charter of the cooperative corporation, and received a telegram in reply.

Mr. President, when I practiced law in Tennessee the law required five individuals to take out a private charter. Only three names were attached to the charter in question; those of Mr. Lillenthal, Mr. H. A. Morgan, and Mr. A. E. Morgan. That seemed to be an unusual proceeding.

The directors of the TVA borrowed \$300,000 from the FERA, and used it for such purposes as they saw fit.

Some Senator undertook to show the other day that that money was relief money. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] said that Tennesseans were starving in 1934; that they did not have enough to eat; that they were wearing fertilizer sacks for clothing. That year I conducted a campaign in Tennessee. That was one of my many campaigns down there. I made a campaign all over the State that year, but I did not see a single individual in a fertilizer sack or in any other kind of a sack, except a sack suit, or if it were a woman, a sack dress. I did not see any people starving in Tennessee that year. The people down there were hard up, of course. People all over the country were hard up at that time. I do not deny that at all. But whether they were hard up or not, the money in question never got to any of them, as I am informed, though not in the telegram from Mr. Armstrong. But he informs me of the illegality of the action in incorporating this cooperative organization. I shall give the telegram to my good friend the Senator from Delaware, who has done such excellent service in connection with the Lillenthal matter.

I read the telegram addressed to me by Mr. Armstrong, as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., March 31, 1947.

Your letter, which was sent air mail but not special delivery came on regular mail delivery this morning after our conversation. Seddon, Ed—

They are his partners—

and I have carefully examined charter you sent. In our opinion this is not a cooperative association. It does not meet requirements of sections 3784 and following sections dealing with cooperative marketing associations or with sections 3884 and following sections dealing with excepted classes including cooperative associations within the general law. Under these provisions of code at least five directors would be required. The charter is attempt to incorporate under the sections of code providing for the incorporation of ordinary business corporations which require only three incorporators and three directors. The charter recites purposes of the corporation to foster the formation of cooperatives and not to act as a cooperative. The general business corporation act does not specifically provide for such a corporation, but it does not prohibit it and generally provides that any lawful business may be incorporated under its provisions. We therefore think that it is a valid charter under the ordinary business corporation law, sections 3709 and following. We find in supplement to Public Acts, Tennessee 1935, this corporation is listed by secretary of state as chartered under ordinary business corporation law.

WALTER P. ARMSTRONG.

If it was, it was a fraud. The Tennessee Valley Authority got the money. I talked with the former Governor of the State, who, someone says, got the money for the TVA, and which was said to have been spent by the TVA. I called former Governor McAlister, who is still living. He is one of the finest men in the world. I asked him if any such thing was ever done, and he said "No." He further stated that he would telegraph me in full tonight. I will impart that information to the Senate tomorrow.

A number of statements have been made, one of which has already been

discussed; namely, that made by the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. He made an excellent showing as to the reasons why these nominations should be recommitted. I wish to add something to those reasons. The Senator from Ohio could not have made a stronger statement.

The Senator from Ohio gave a number of reasons why the nominations should be sent back to the committee, every one of which is good. The Senate should have the facts within the possession of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the facts in the files of the Department of Justice and the Army and Navy Intelligence, before passing upon these nominations in haste. I read an editorial in the New York Times to the effect that it was the duty of the Senate to pass upon these nominations at once.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator will recall the letter which I wrote to the President with respect to the information in the files of the investigating agencies, and the reply which the President wrote to me as chairman of the committee, giving me his assurance as President of the United States that a thorough check had been made of the files and the information contained in the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Army and Navy Intelligence, and such other investigative agencies of the United States as might have information, and giving me, as chairman of the committee, his word as President of the United States that there was nothing in any of those files derogatory to any of the appointees.

I ask the Senator from Tennessee, in all sincerity: Am I, upon the basis of that high assurance from a man whom I respect personally, and who holds an office which I respect mightily, to say that that man is distorting facts, and that the highest officer of the United States is misleading me as a member of a Senate committee?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Am I to assume that he is concealing matters of vital importance?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I feel that under the circumstances I am entitled to rely upon the assurances of the man who holds the highest and most sacred office in the United States.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Let me say in reply that I do not ask the Senator or the Senate committee to do anything of the kind. I would not do it myself. I have the highest respect and admiration for President Truman. I know that he is perfectly honest. But the Constitution of the United States, which is now a good many years old—even older than I am—provides that the President shall make nominations, but that an officer may not be placed in office until his nomination is confirmed by the Senate.

There may be various reasons why we should have the information. Some one may have misinformed the President.

The President cannot go into all the details of every nomination he makes. It is impossible. If the Constitution had meant that we should accept the assurance of the President, it would have so provided, and under those circumstances if the President were to say in his message that the appointment was proper the Senate would have to confirm it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I merely wished to make clear one thing. I was not so much disagreeing with the Senator at the moment in anything he said, but I inferred from the message he just read that the sender of the message insinuated that there were sinister things in the files of the investigative agencies of the Government, which we should have. In answer to that insinuation, which I took from the message which the Senator read, and not from the Senator's own statement, I stated that we had the assurance of the highest officer of the United States that there is nothing in those files derogatory to any of the appointees.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am sure the President feels that there is nothing of that nature. I am sure that the Senator from Iowa feels the same way I do about the President's statement, that it should have the very highest position. But the Senate is required to act upon its own responsibility, and not upon the responsibility of the President of the United States. The Constitution, under which we all serve, requires that the Senate act upon its own initiative and upon its own knowledge. Things which may appear one way to a perfectly honest man may appear entirely different in my view or in the view of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], or the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. One cannot always tell. We must pass upon the nomination as a matter of constitutional duty, and I think we ought to have the information.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I wanted very much to ask the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] a question when he concluded his address. I listened attentively. As I recall his statement, he said that the President had assured the chairman of the Senate section of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that there was nothing in the files derogatory to Mr. Lillenthal.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I decline to yield.

Mr. HAWKES. The only point I wish to make—and I can make it without waiting for the answer—is that if my interpretation of what was said is correct, if I were to say to the Senator, "I find nothing derogatory in the file regarding John Jones," it would not mean a thing in the world unless the Senator knew how far I had investigated John Jones. That is the point I wished to make.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot do so now. The hour is growing late and I wish to conclude. I shall be glad to yield to my colleague a little later.

These nominations should go back to the committee for the reasons stated by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. They have all shown good reasons why we should get the facts in this particular case. These are very important nominations. They are not yet appointments; they are nominations. I doubt if the Senate will ever be called upon to consider more important nominations. I know that in the more than 30 years during which I have been a Member of this body I have never been called upon to consider any appointments of equal importance.

I am sure that if our good President had thought of it for a moment he would have felt the same way and would have sent those files to the committee.

Mr. President, I am advised that the tax records of the Treasury Department should be examined in order to see whether Mr. Lilienthal has paid the income taxes which he should have paid. I was told that one of his leftist TVA books has had eight editions. I am referring to the book entitled "Democracy on the March." I wonder what eleemosynary institution has received the profits?

The Senate should look into these matters. It is known that he misrepresented the facts in Chicago and in Madison, Wis. Why should not the Senate look into these questions as they arise?

At the present time the Atomic Energy Commission is a de facto commission only. I am advised that it is operating on funds transferred from the War Department. I have written Secretary Patterson, requesting information concerning the legality of this transfer of funds. How can the Secretary of War legally transfer to a de facto commission, a commission which is not yet confirmed, the great amount of money which is necessary to operate it?

As I shall later show by affidavit, the whole situation in Oak Ridge, Tenn., is changing. It is a town located on Government property. In it there were about 45,000 people. Certain concessions had been operated, but the concessions are now being taken up and the whole plant is changing into a nationally operated enterprise. It will be similar to TVA. When Mr. Lilienthal obtained charge of TVA he changed the law regarding the civil service, with reference to retirement, with reference to flood control, with reference to reporting profits to the Government of the United States. He changed laws all along the line. Why should the Senate permit this to be done before he even becomes a member of the Atomic Energy Commission? I think the Senate should look into the subject.

As I stated, the city of Oak Ridge, Tenn., now a city of 45,000 people, is entirely on Government property. Its merchants, doctors, dentists, and various other businesses and civilian services are

all let to a firm with headquarters in New York known as the Roane-Anderson Co., Inc., which charges 10 percent or more on gross receipts of all business done.

I am advised that this de facto commission has recently taken over the city of Oak Ridge and that they expect to bring cooperatives into this section. This is another thing that should be investigated before these nominations are confirmed.

In this connection it will be remembered that as soon as Mr. Lilienthal took charge of the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1933 he made a deal with Dr. H. A. Morgan to conduct the affairs of the Commission so far as possible, and that they paid very little attention to Dr. A. E. Morgan after that combination was made.

This time the record shows that Mr. Lilienthal himself recommended a majority of the members of the Commission, namely, himself, Mr. Waymack, and Dr. Bacher. So he will have absolute control from the very beginning.

It will also be remembered that Mr. Lilienthal in his conduct of the Tennessee Valley Authority utterly disregarded the laws of the United States, including the law under which the TVA Act was passed. There is nothing in the TVA Act allowing Mr. Lilienthal to disregard the general law of the civil service, but he at once repealed the civil-service law insofar as the TVA was concerned. He also repealed the retirement law insofar as the TVA was concerned; he also repealed the flood-control law insofar as the TVA was concerned; and he also repealed the general-accounting law insofar as the TVA was concerned. He set up special laws of his own for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I wish to make a brief statement before I conclude, and then I shall ask for a recess.

Mr. Lilienthal has recently appointed three well-known Communists. The Commission is a de facto commission. His own nomination has not yet been confirmed, but he has appointed three well-known Communists. One is Herbert S. Marks, general counsel, receiving a salary of \$14,000. I believe the law provides that under certain unusual circumstances the Commission, when it becomes a commission, can fix certain salaries. So it has given Mr. Marks a salary of \$14,000 a year.

The next Communist is Richard G. Niehoff, assistant general manager, at a salary of \$10,000 a year.

The next one is James Thomas Ramey, whose salary is not stated. But Mr. Lilienthal has surrounded himself in the case of three of the most important offices with men who are well-known Communists.

Should the Senate confirm the nomination of the man under those circumstances? I am appealing to the Senate as sensible men, because I have served with most of the Senators who are present for a long time, and I know that they, just as I do, have but one ambition in life, and that is to do the honest, honorable, careful, and prudent thing regarding our great country. We have the greatest country in the world. It is being attacked on all sides in various

ways. Some nations want to borrow money, others want us to give them money. Some of them have very bad feelings toward this country. We have helped from time to time practically all the nations of the world.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Can the Senator inform the Senate where there is any basis in the record for his saying that the testimony shows that three persons connected with the Atomic Energy Commission are well-known Communists? I am sure the Senator does not mean that, because there is nothing in the record which shows any such thing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. It is shown on page 240 of the record. If the Senator will look at it he will find them all in the list on that page of the record.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is an entirely different situation. Being accused of being a Communist and being a well-known Communist are two different things. I submit that there is no such testimony in the record.

Mr. McKELLAR. The record is before us. I know the Senator has not looked at it carefully, or has read it erroneously. I do not charge him with any wrongdoing. The Senator is very much worked up. I regret that he feels the way he does, but I know he is sincere.

I wish to call attention to something else—

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds further, will he yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not care to discuss the matter at this moment, but I assure the Senate that I thoroughly disagree with the Senator's statement that there is convincing proof in the record that those men are well-known Communists, or even Communists of any degree. I shall discuss that question later, but I did not want the statement to pass at this time without mention. I disagree with the Senator's statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I accept the Senator's disagreement, but the fact is that we have taken proof, and all three of those men were seen going in or coming out of Communist meetings. Various witnesses have testified that they were Communists. None of those three men has confessed it. Mr. Lilienthal did introduce three Communist witnesses, and I believe they were the only three witnesses from the Tennessee Valley Authority who were introduced. Two associates of Mr. Lilienthal on the TVA did not testify for him. He has had half a dozen different general counsels, and they did not testify for him. Even the Representatives and Senators who appeared before the other committee and testified in behalf of Mr. Clapp did not come before the committee and testify for Mr. Lilienthal. No prominent men in Tennessee testified in favor of Mr. Lilienthal. As I recall, there were not to exceed half a dozen witnesses from Tennessee who testified in favor of Mr. Lilienthal. None of his associates so testified, none of his friends, no public officer of any kind, Democrat or Republican. None of them testified, but he had three Communist witnesses.

Who were they? The first one was Mr. Hart. Mr. Hart testified for Mr. Lillenthal. Mr. Hart was a Communist. He said he had gotten over it, but he never resigned from the Communist Party; he just stopped. The next one was Mr. Cameron, and the other one was Mr. Frantz. Those were the three Communists. Is it not remarkable, I ask the distinguished Senator, my friend, who was on the committee, and at whose vote I was never more surprised than at anything in my life. I know he does not mind my saying that, because he is one of the finest of men; I refer to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. If a man had hit me in the face without notice, I could not have been more surprised than I was when I read in the newspapers that the Senator from Colorado had voted the other way in this case. I could not believe that he knew the facts relative to the matter on which he was voting.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I simply wish to keep the Record straight. The three men to whom the Senator from Tennessee referred a moment ago as coming before the committee and testifying for Mr. Lillenthal—Mr. Hart, Mr. Cameron, and Mr. Frantz—appeared after the repeated insistence of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no, Mr. President; no insistence on my part will be found in the Record. I kept on making fun of the committee for not bringing the Communists along. I did that. I "took on" a little with the Senator; but they are not my witnesses. I never brought a Communist witness into any controversy in my life; and I never expect to do so. Why? Because my understanding of a Communist is that he will deny anything so long as he thinks by so doing he will help communism or will help himself. That is why I never have called on any Communists. There was another witness from the TVA, an employee of the TVA. I do not know whether he was a Communist. He was brought from the TVA. I refer to a man by the name of Schlemmer—a fine name. I think it is a German name, and I believe he or one of his parents came from Switzerland. Someone introduced him as a witness, and as the head of a woolen mill near Chattanooga. I shall put in the Record the telegram about him. Mr. Schlemmer worked for the TVA, in some subordinate capacity, from 1933 to 1946, in August or September; and then he got a job as manager of one of the sections of the woolen mill to which I have referred. He has no office in the woolen mill and he has no actual interest in it. That is the kind of testimony that came from the TVA for Mr. Lillenthal.

Mr. President, I say to the acting majority leader that if he wishes to move at this time that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow, I shall gladly yield for that purpose.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record at this point an editorial entitled "A Spare-Time Issue," published in the New York Times for

Friday, March 28. The editorial bears on the pending discussion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A SPARE-TIME ISSUE

It is 2 months yesterday since the Senate section of the Atomic Energy Committee opened its hearings on the nominations of Chairman David E. Lillenthal and his colleagues on the United States Atomic Commission. It is 18 days today since the committee approved the nominations. The Senate waited 14 days before taking them up for debate. During that period it dealt with some important things, but also with many minor ones, such as a resolution authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to set up daylight saving if they wanted to. Last Monday the Senate took up the AEC nominations, and recessed at 3:24 p. m. Since Monday the debate has continued, as Anthony Leviero wrote in this newspaper, "on an on-again-off-again basis, fitted in as a spare-time issue."

Meanwhile, what does the Senate and what does the public suppose is happening to the Atomic Energy Commission? This agency is directed, under the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, to undertake research in the atomic field; to guide, foster, and safeguard private research; to take over all fissionable materials and all the facilities for processing them; to develop, control and license non-military uses of atomic energy; to work with the armed forces in developing military uses of atomic energy pending any "international arrangement" to which this country is a party outlawing such uses. The great discovery which shook the world when the bombs fell on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and again when they fell on Bikini lagoon, is in this agency's hands. If the AEC cannot act no one can.

What is happening while these nominations are being "fitted in as a spare-time issue" is that the AEC is paralyzed. Chairman Lillenthal, his four fellow directors, and his general manager are acting in an interim capacity. In that capacity they can make no binding promises and enter into no long-range contracts. Their organization is in danger of disintegrating and collapsing. Good men are leaving the AEC because of its uncertainties. Other good men are refusing to sign up with it. They can draw larger salaries in private employment, but that is not their reason. Their reason is that the Senate seems bent on treating the most important issue in their world as a spare-time political item.

If we think of fissionable material as a weapon still exclusively ours, we will see the national defense imperiled by these delays. If we think of it as a means of drawing the world together and bringing lasting peace and prosperity for all mankind, we will see these objectives imperiled, too.

An actual majority of the Senators have expressed themselves in favor of confirmation. They risk their country's future if they do not now speed up debate and bring these nominations to a vote.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a telegram which Governor La Follette, of Wisconsin, sent the committee in reference to certain charges made against Mr. Lillenthal.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Atomic Energy Committee, Washington, D. C.:

I note the imputation that David Lillenthal was underhandedly serving private interests while on Wisconsin Public Service Commis-

sion. When offered the appointment he was active in his profession and naturally had to wind up his affairs. He fully and completely disclosed his affairs and subsequently filed in the Governor's office a copy of the contract which his affairs were wound up. His record as commissioner was outstanding devoted public service and wholly honorable.

PHILIP F. LA FOLLETTE.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow. In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] be recognized tomorrow noon when the Senate convenes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I now move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 1, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 31 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Cavendish W. Cannon, of Utah, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Yugoslavia.

Walter J. Donnelly, of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Costa Rica.

Stanton Griffiths, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Poland.

Williamson S. Howell, Jr., of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uruguay.

Albert F. Nufer, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

Fletcher Warren, of Texas, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Nicaragua, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay.

John C. Wiley, of Indiana, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

OFFICE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE RECORDS

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey to be Director of the Office of Selective Service Records.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Charles Lee Spillers, of West Virginia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of West Virginia, vice Joe V. Gibson, deceased.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Capt. Charles North Howze, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 11, 1941, First Lt. William Benton Carne, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from December 14, 1946.

First Lt. Clifford Thomas Riordan, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 14, 1941.

Second Lt. Ralph Henderson Miller, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 16, 1944.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Capt. John Rodgers Clifton, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from January 15, 1944.

Capt. Richard Wallace Cook, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from August 8, 1942.

Capt. Travis Ludwell Petty, Chemical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1944.

First Lt. John Benjamin Beckham, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 18, 1943.

First Lt. Robert Everts Clark, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Thomas McGahey Elgin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 1, 1946.

First Lt. James Edward Hammer, Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from February 20, 1945.

First Lt. John Douglas McCormick, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 25, 1945.

First Lt. John Parrish McWhorter, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from August 28, 1940.

First Lt. James Beatty Meanor, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from December 7, 1944.

First Lt. William Henry Harrison Mullin, Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1943.

First Lt. James Herschell Nash, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 1, 1946.

First Lt. John James Petro, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 15, 1942.

First Lt. Charles Victor Pregaldin, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from December 7, 1944.

First Lt. Charles Elmer Wright, Cavalry (temporary major), with rank from April 8, 1940.

Second Lt. William Jackson Bowen, Air Corps, with rank from June 5, 1945.

Second Lt. Hobart E. Dewey, Field Artillery, with rank from October 20, 1945.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Merle Robbins Williams, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 10, 1942.

First Lt. Robert Huff Edger, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. John Carpenter Raaen, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

TO SIGNAL CORPS

First Lt. Dayton Willis Eddy, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 20, 1945.

First Lt. William McKinley Shepard, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1945.

TO CHEMICAL CORPS

Capt. Charles Heron McNary, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from March 11, 1943.

First Lt. Noel Ambrose Menard, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

TO CAVALRY

First Lt. Robert Morris Blair, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1945.

First Lt. Merritt Lambert Hewitt, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. James Lawrence Kaiser, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Horrell Holcomb Smith, Infantry, with rank from September 3, 1945.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Capt. Bryon Leslie Paige, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 10, 1942.

Capt. Pasquale Francis Passarella, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 11, 1941.

First Lt. Charles Baker Cole, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 18, 1946.

First Lt. Joseph Francis Dunn, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 20, 1945.

First Lt. Edward Henry Hendrickson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1943.

First Lt. William Jay Henry, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Page Spencer Jackson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 1, 1946.

First Lt. Herbert Eugene Kemp, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. Robert Pershing Muir, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from December 7, 1944.

First Lt. Robert Walter Samz, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Stephen Silvasy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1943.

Second Lt. Lawrence Frank Ciszewski, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1944.

TO INFANTRY

Capt. Albert Raymond Cupello, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from December 21, 1945.

First Lt. Paul Alonzo Bane, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from November 20, 1942.

First Lt. Robert Frank Barrett, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from March 11, 1946.

First Lt. Roy Hilsman Bass, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from April 23, 1946.

First Lt. Andrew James Boechler, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from August 6, 1946.

First Lt. Haskett Lynch Conner, Jr., Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Charles Thomas Heinrich, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from January 5, 1943.

First Lt. Eugene Harvey Kipp, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from November 18, 1946.

First Lt. John Joseph Short, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 29, 1945.

First Lt. Charles Carroll Thebaud, Field Artillery, with rank from December 13, 1946.

TO AIR CORPS

Lt. Col. Edward Barber, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from August 4, 1944.

Lt. Col. Stephen Cecil Lombard, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1945.

Lt. Col. Wallace William Millard, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from August 18, 1940.

Lt. Col. Hugh Whitt, Finance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from September 17, 1940.

Lt. Col. Lloyd Nelson Winters, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from February 4, 1941.

Maj. Eimer Blair Garland, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 14, 1944.

Maj. Samuel Howard Morrow, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1941.

Capt. Calvin Mitchel Bryan, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 28, 1941.

Capt. Harold Cooper Donnelly, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1943.

Capt. Frederic Henry Fairchild, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1943.

Capt. Francis Raymond Fee, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 1, 1944.

Capt. Emory Edwin Hackman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1943.

Capt. James Rollo McNitt, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from November 12, 1945.

Capt. Buford Russell Nyquist, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

Capt. Ross Thatcher Sampson, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

Capt. William Theodore Welter, Adjutant General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 11, 1942.

First Lt. Donald Earl Adams, Field Artillery, with rank from August 30, 1946.

First Lt. Wilbur Winston Bailey, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Wallace Erwin Bjornson, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 20, 1945.

First Lt. Benjamin Paul Blasingame, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 20, 1945.

First Lt. Roland Wallace Boughton, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Julian Holt Bowman, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 31, 1944.

First Lt. Charles Urban Brombach, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Clifton Lewis Butler, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. William Brooks Carroll, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1945.

First Lt. Glenn Craddock Coleman, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 14, 1941.

First Lt. Glenn B. Daughton, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 20, 1945.

First Lt. Thomas Edward Delbridge, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from September 5, 1945.

First Lt. John William Dell, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from November 28, 1944.

First Lt. Thomas Legate Fisher 2d, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Edwin Thomas Hall, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from December 19, 1945.

First Lt. Max Woodrow Hall, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Roy Cleveland Heflebower, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 14, 1941.

First Lt. John Michael Johannes, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from August 2, 1943.

First Lt. William Daniel Kennedy, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from December 24, 1944.

First Lt. William Eugene Lewis, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. Lee Ronald Lucas, Field Artillery, with rank from May 24, 1946.

First Lt. James Beecher McKenzie, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1945.

First Lt. Douglas Blakeshaw Netherwood, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. John Joseph Neu, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from December 5, 1946.

First Lt. Frederick Kenneth Nichols, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 23, 1945.

First Lt. Don Richard Ostrander, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

First Lt. Augustin Mitchell Prentiss, Jr., Chemical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

First Lt. Michel Andre George Robinson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. George Florin Ruff, Ordnance Department (temporary captain), with rank from September 9, 1945.

First Lt. Eugene Elam Skinner, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from December 7, 1944.

First Lt. John Farley Splain, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1944.

First Lt. Charles Darwin Trall, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from December 7, 1944.

First Lt. Haywood Cooper Vaughan, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from February 16, 1946.

Second Lt. George Russell Berry, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 2, 1944.

Second Lt. Walter Baird Kamp, Infantry, with rank from September 1, 1945.

Second Lt. Andrew Raymond Reeves, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 20, 1945.

Second Lt. John Wilbur Switzer, Infantry, with rank from August 4, 1945.

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

First Lt. William McKinney Mantz, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 3, 1944.

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Capt. Menon Walker Whitsitt, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from September 14, 1946.

First Lt. Ivan Hurst Impson, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from August 10, 1940.

First Lt. William Forest Locke, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from September 27, 1940.

First Lt. Arnold Ray Thomas, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1944.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Capt. Elmer Willford Grubbs, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1946.

First Lt. Homer Griswold Barber, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Selby McKay Frank, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from December 3, 1942.

First Lt. Sidney Katz, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 1, 1946.

First Lt. Elwyn Norman Kirsten, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

First Lt. Russell Faux Scott, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 1, 1946.

First Lt. Robert Edward Summerall, Infantry, with rank from May 8, 1946.

Second Lt. John Thornton Peterson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1944.

TO CAVALRY

Capt. Paul LeGrand Jolley, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 18, 1946.

First Lt. George Alvin Berlin, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from November 12, 1945.

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

Capt. James Pickett Smith, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 28, 1946.

Second Lt. Leslie Edwards Babcock, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1944.

TO INFANTRY

First Lt. Michael Edward Wardell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1945.

TO AIR CORPS

Maj. William Lafayette Fagg, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1946.

Maj. Luke Bruce Graham, Finance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1946.

Maj. William Lloyd Richardson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1941.

Capt. Jack Lawrence Armstrong, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 5, 1946.

Capt. Francis Joseph Corr, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

Capt. John Brazelton Fillmore Dice, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1940.

Capt. Robert Frederick Frost, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1946.

Capt. Arthur Lafayette Inman, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1944.

Capt. Edwin Malcolm Kirton, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from December 3, 1944.

Capt. Orville Laird, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 9, 1942.

First Lt. Haynes Madden Baumgardner, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from December 5, 1946.

First Lt. Donal Blair Cunningham, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 9, 1946.

First Lt. James Creelman Huntley, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. John Alwine Kelper, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from September 7, 1945.

First Lt. Michael Nicholas Mikulak, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from December 2, 1940.

First Lt. Eugene Smith, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from December 10, 1941.

First Lt. Donald Henry Vleck, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 19, 1946.

First Lt. Theodore John Witt, Cavalry (temporary captain), with rank from December 7, 1944.

Second Lt. Joseph Walter Stephens, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from September 22, 1943.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Harry Innes Thornton Creswell, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Kenneth McCatty, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

X Lt. Col. Harold Holmes Ristine, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

X Lt. Col. Charles Timothy Senay, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Egmont Francis Koenig, Infantry (temporary colonel).

X Lt. Col. Theodore Woodward Wrenn, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Harold Whitaker Rehm, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Peter Kenrick Kelly, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Clifford Hildebrandt Tate, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

X Lt. Col. Oliver Patton Echols, Air Corps (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. John Murray Jenkins, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Beverly Hare Colner, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Robert Edgar Turley, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Arthur Henry Truxes, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Gordon Joseph Fred Heron, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Archelaus Lewis Hamblen, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Paul Whitten Mapes, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Robert Chauncey Macon, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Stanley Bacon, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. William Curtis Chase, Cavalry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Norman Edgar Fiske, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Wilson Tarlton Bals, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Cyrus Jenness Wilder, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Harold Charles Fellows, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. George Lester Kraft, Infantry (temporary colonel).

X Lt. Col. John Singleton Switzer, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Robert Ellsworth Phillips, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Allen Frederick Kingman, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Leander Russell Hathaway, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Theodore Pierce, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Wilmer Stanley Phillips, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Leven Cooper Allen, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Oliver Arlington Hess, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Edward Amende Allen, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Jedediah Huntington Hills, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Donald Strong Perry, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Frederick Reid Lafferty, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

X Lt. Col. David Renwick Kerr, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Arthur Titman Lacey, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Paul Hills French, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Sidney Sohns Eberle, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. David Wilson Craig, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Thomas Gannt Dobyns, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

X Lt. Col. Walter Alexander Pashley, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Edward Fondren Shafer, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Richard Gentry Tindall, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Graham Wallace Lester, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Francis Artaud Byrne, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Farragut Ferry Hall, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

- Lt. Col. Orville Monroe Moore, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Leonard Russell Boyd, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Withers Alexander Burriss, Infantry (temporary major general).
- Lt. Col. John Cheney Platt, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Paul Nutwell Starlings, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Sevier Rains Tupper, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Irving Carrington Avery, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Aaron Joseph Becker, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. James Vernon Ware, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Robert Washington Brown, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Manuel Benigno Navas, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Enrique Manuel Benitez, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Modesto Enrique Rodriguez, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. John Warlick McDonald, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. David Hazen Blakelock, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. John Warren Cotton, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- × Lt. Col. Albert Russell Ives, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Paul James Dowling, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. John Lenhart Rice, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Willis Henry Hale, Air Corps (temporary major general).
- Lt. Col. William Cheney Moore, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Wharton Girard Ingram, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Clarence Paul Evers, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Adrian St. John, Chemical Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. John Colford Daly, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Paul Everton Peabody, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
- × Lt. Col. Albert Francis Christie, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Ray Milton O'Day, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- × Lt. Col. James Madison Garrett, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Julian Wallace Cunningham, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Clarence Edward Cotter, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Edmund Bernard Edwards, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Merritt Elijah Olmstead, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Benjamin Franklin Caffey, Jr., Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. Frank August Heileman, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. Clinton Albert Pierce, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. Otto Blaine Trigg, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Edison Albert Lynn, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Henry Davis Jay, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Clarence Maxwell Culp, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Ray Lawrence Burnell, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Raphael Saul Chavin, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. John Lester Scott, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
- × Lt. Col. Philip Shaw Wood, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. William Henry McCutcheon, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Adlai Cyrus Young, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Clinton Inness McClure, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Evan Clouser Seaman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Henry Rasick Behrens, Coast Artillery Corps.
- Lt. Col. Roy Charles Lemach Graham, Quartermaster Corps (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. George Ralph Barker, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- × Lt. Col. John Waldemar Thompson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Charles Sabin Ferrin, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. Roger Hilsman, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Holmes Ely Dager, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. Harry Elmer Fischer, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Louis Whorley Hasslock, Field Artillery.
- Lt. Col. Frederick Stone Matthews, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Marcus Aurelius Smith Ming, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Walter Raymond Graham, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. James Patrick Murphy, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Jacob Edward Bechtold, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Neal Creighton Johnson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Norman Pyle Groff, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Glenn Adelbert Ross, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Francis Augustus Woolfley, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Nelson Dingley 3d, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Richard Weaver Hocker, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Joseph Ware Whitney, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Peter Paul Salgado, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- × Lt. Col. Edward William Bondy, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Andrew Jackson McFarland, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. John Miller Fray, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Harold Howard Galliett, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. John Vincell Stark, Infantry.
- Lt. Col. Grover Be Egger, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Paul Oscar Franson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- × Lt. Col. John Neely Hopkins, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. George William Gillette, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. William Agnew Howland, Infantry.
- Lt. Col. Clifton Augustine Pritchett, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Luke Donald Zech, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Lucian Dalton Bogan, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- × Lt. Col. William Pitt Morse, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Roy Eugene Blount, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. Hubert Vincent Hopkins, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Frank Edwin Sharpless, Infantry.
- Lt. Col. Neils Erick Stadig, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Ben-Hur Chastaine, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Leigh Bell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. George Frederick Spann, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Harry Clayton Luck, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Harry Richardson Simmons, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Kenneth Frederick Hanst, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Everett Charles Williams, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Maurice Clenen Bigelow, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- × Lt. Col. Thomas Ralph Kerschner, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Otho Wilder Humphries, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Perry Lee Baldwin, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. George Thomas Shank, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Thomas Butler Burgess, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Albert Chester Searle, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Carl Austin Russell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Will Gillett Gooch, Quartermaster Corp (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Chauncey Harold Hayden, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Erle Oden Sandlin, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Isaac George Walker, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Walter Edward Jenkins, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Ernest Louis McLendon, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Rhodes Felton Arnold, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- × Lt. Col. Eugene Nelson Slappey, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Harwood Christian Bowman, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Rosenham Beam, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
- × Lt. Col. Pleas Blair Rogers, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Frank Alfred Jones, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Donald Wilson, Air Corps (temporary major general).
- Lt. Col. Frank Austin Heywood, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Charles McDonald Parkin, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- × Lt. Col. Philip Coleman Clayton, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. William Francis Heavey, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Robert Marks Bathurst, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. Daniel Noce, Corps of Engineers (temporary major general).
- Lt. Col. Willis Edward Teale, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Clark Kittrell, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Henry Hutchings, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Henry John Schroeder, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. John Matthew Devine, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. Harold Albert Nisley, Ordnance Department (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. James Louis Guion, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. George Douglas Wahl, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Basil Harrison Perry, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Harold Rufus Jackson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Ray Hartwell Lewis, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Augustus Milton Gurney, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. John Trott Murray, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Morris Keene Barroll, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Warfield Monroe Lewis, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Walter Wilton Warner, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

- Lt. Col. Rex Webb Beasley, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Ira Adam Crump, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Elbert Louis Ford, Ordnance Department (temporary brigadier general).
 Lt. Col. John Tupper Cole, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. George Sampson Beurket, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Charles Hunter Gerhardt, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
 Lt. Col. Frederick Augustus Irving, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
 Lt. Col. Burnett Ralph Olmsted, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Irvin Edward Doane, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Albert Cowper Smith, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
 Lt. Col. Richard Mars Wightman, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Charles Walter Yuill, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. William Willis Eagles, Infantry (temporary major general).
 Lt. Col. Joel Grant Holmes, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. William Sackville, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Louis LeRoy Martin, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. William Kelly Harrison, Jr., Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
 Lt. Col. Ernest Nason Harmon, Cavalry (temporary major general).
 Lt. Col. Christian Gingrich Foltz, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Joseph Scranton Tate, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Arthur McKinley Harper, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
 Lt. Col. Carleton Coulter, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Aaron Bradshaw, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general).
 Lt. Col. Robert Newton Kunz, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Willis Richardson Slaughter, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. George Hatton Weems, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
 Lt. Col. Charles Radcliffe Johnson, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. William Claude McMahon, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Bertrand Morrow, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Harry Russell Pierce, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Lawrence Collamore Mitchell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Milton Baldridge Halsey, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
 Lt. Col. Charles Love Mullins, Jr., Infantry (temporary major general).
 Lt. Col. Sterling Alexander Wood, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Alexander Hunkins Campbell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. David Sheridan Rumbough, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Marvil Groves Armstrong, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Donovan Swanton, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Francis Atherton Macon, Jr., Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Laurence Bolton Keiser, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
 Lt. Col. Homer Caffee Brown, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Clare Hibbs Armstrong, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. John Clement Whitcomb, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Wallace James Redner, Quartermaster Corps.
 Lt. Col. Paul Hancock Brown, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. William Stuart Eley, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Joseph Pescia Sullivan, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Clarke Kent Fales, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Solomon Foote Clark, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Russell Gilbert Barkalow, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Frank Augustus Keating, Infantry (temporary major general).
 Lt. Col. Richard David Daugherty, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Joseph Clark Addington, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Allison Joseph Barnett, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
 Lt. Col. George Frederick Unmacht, Chemical Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. William Settle Evans, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Walter Moody Tenney, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Richard Bartholomew Moran, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Arthur Oscar Walsh, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Welcome Porter Waltz, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Edwin Hugh Johnson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Russel McKee Herrington, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Lewis Abram Pulling, Cavalry.
 Lt. Col. Fred Matthew Fogle, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Charles Erwin Rayens, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Sidney Feagin Dunn, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. William Hones, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Breckinridge Atwater Day, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. George David Shea, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
 Lt. Col. Donald Coe Hawley, Cavalry.
 Lt. Col. Francis Truman Bonsteel, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. William Edwin Barott, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Frank Nelson, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. John Homer Carriker, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Benjamin Harrison Hensley, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Frank Henry Barnhart, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Henry Theophil John Weishaar, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Henry Jeffrey Matchett, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. John William Bulger, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Frank Moore Child, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Hurley Edward Fuller, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. John Paul Horan, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. William Benjamin Wright, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Richard Whitney Carter, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Wendell Lowell Bevan, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Augustus Brown O'Connell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. George Archibald King, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Henry Fred Grimm, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Richard Terrell Guthrie, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Alan Lockhart Campbell, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Donald Langley Dutton, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Frederick Harold Leroy Ryder, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Lloyd Davidson Brown, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Christancy Pickett, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Luis Felipe Cianchini, Infantry.
 Lt. Col. Ernest Terrill Barco, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Lester Amiel Daugherty, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Raymond Edward O'Neill, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Frank Melvin S. Johnson, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Porter Prescott Lowry, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Jerome Jackson Waters, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. John Urban Ayotte, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Charles Heyward Barnwell, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Edward George Herlihy, Infantry.
 Lt. Col. Arnold John Funk, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
 Lt. Col. Alexander Shepherd Quintard, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Harry Allen Skerry, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Norman Minus, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Heywood Shallos Dodd, Cavalry.
 Lt. Col. Kent Craig Lambert, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Sylvester Emery Nortner, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Frank Wiltshire Gano, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Samuel Davies Bedinger, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Malcolm Vaughn Fortier, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Ray Bradford Conner, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. John Lloyd McKee, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Glenn Luman Allen, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Robert Henry Chance, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Harry Augustine Buckley, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Willfred Rowell Higgins, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Jesse Plez Green, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Howard Winthrop Turner, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Wesley Crowell Brigham, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Cyrus Higginson Searcy, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Turner Ransom Sharp, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Ward Currey Goessling, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Harold Burton Gibson, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Victor Roland Woodruff, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Gustav Adolph Mellanchton Anderson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Robert William Yates, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Dana Caswell Schmah, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Harry Adamson, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Owen Rivers Rhoads, Infantry.
 Lt. Col. Carl Russell Adams, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Elmer Forrest Wallender, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Herman Feldman, Quartermaster Corps (Assistant to the Quartermaster General with rank of brigadier general).
 Lt. Col. Ernest Alvin Kindervater, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Gordon Cogswell Irwin, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).

- Lt. Col. John Harvey Fye, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. George Mood MacMullin, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Nicholas Szilagyi, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Frederick Weston Hyde, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Charles Royal Lehner, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Rosser Lee Hunter, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Carroll Arthur Powell, Signal Corps (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. Feodor Otto Schmidt, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. James Francis Brittingham, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Oscar Bergstrom Abbott, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Carter Roderick McLennan, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Louis Garland Gibney, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Thomas Grady Jenkins, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Leslie Carlyle Wheat, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Walter Compere Lattimore, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Russell Hubbard Dixon, Field Artillery.
- Lt. Col. Everett Marshall Graves, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. William Tuttle Hamilton, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. William Valentine McCreight, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. William Granville Purdy, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Harry Howard Baird, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Claudius Leo Lloyd, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Carlisle Barksdale Cox, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Stanley Gloninger Saulnier, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Will Hughes Gordon, Infantry.
- Lt. Col. Willard Wadsworth Irvine, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. Charles Emerson Boyle, Field Artillery.
- Lt. Col. William Doughty Evans, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. William Benjamin Tuttle, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Donald Armpriester Stroh, Infantry (temporary major general).
- Lt. Col. Edwin Adolph Henn, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Thomas Clyde McCormick, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. George Raymond Owens, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Andrew Davis Bruce, Infantry (temporary major general).
- Lt. Col. John Edward Maher, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Joseph Philip Kohn, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Dallas Loyd Knoll, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Robert Justin Van Buskirk, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Floyd Emerson Galloway, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Henry Yost Lyon, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Paxton Sterrett Campbell, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. William Ross Irvin, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Alfred Lyons Baylies, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Roy Leo Schuyler, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Louis DeSaussure Hutson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Frederick Linwood Topping, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Charles Richard Doran, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. George Ralston Middleton, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Guy Douglas Thompson, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. David Lee Hooper, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Thomas Raphael Phillips, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Oliver Edward George Trechter, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Richard Allen Gordon, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. John Lee Autrey, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Napoleon Boudreau, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Clarence LeRoy Strike, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Clyde Charles Alexander, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Grover Cleveland Graham, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Joseph Howard Rustemeyer, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Harry Foster, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Sexton Berg, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Cornelius Francis O'Keefe, Cavalry.
- Lt. Col. Samuel Israel Zeidner, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Raymond Dresden Willis, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Elliot Duncan Cooke, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. Alfred Steere Knight, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Thomas Watson Hastey, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Chester John Hirschfelder, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Herbert Allyn Myers, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Frank Emil Stoner, Signal Corps (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. Roy Francis Lynd, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Edward Henry Taliaferro, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. George Corbett Pilkington, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Valentine Pearsall Foster, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. John Henry Ball, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Everett Ernest Brown, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. Fay Ross, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Nels Louis Soderholm, Infantry.
- Lt. Col. Malcolm Byrne, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Sydney Clyde Ferguson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Severne Spence MacLaughlin, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Burton Francis Hood, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Patrick Eugene Shea, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. James Truman Menzie, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Eugene Martin Foster, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Glenn Alonzo Ross, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Mark Vinton Brunson, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Norman Doud Finley, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Philip Theodore Fry, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Edgar Joseph Tulley, Infantry.
- Lt. Col. Wilmer Micajah Flinn, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Bernard Smith, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Lewis Charles Beebe, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. William Van Dyke Ochs, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Douglass Newman McMillin, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Gersum Cronander, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Harold Borden Bliss, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Ernest Coolidge Goding, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Lawrence Stanley Woods, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. George Irvin Smith, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Macey Lillard Dill, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Edgar Peter Sorensen, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. Edward Julius Renth, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. John Henry Harrington, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Francis Firmin Fainter, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Peter Girardeau Marshall, Jr., Infantry.
- Lt. Col. Edward Brigham McKinley, Quartermaster Corps (temporary brigadier general).
- ×Lt. Col. Walter Patrick O'Brien, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Frank Brevard Hayne, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Lloyd Chandler Parsons, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Theodore Edward Thomas Haley, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. William Archibald Campbell, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. James Clark Hughes, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. William Gregory Brey, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. William Henry Sadler, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Frederick Sidney Doll, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Lawrence Gibson Forsythe, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Humphrey Swygart Evans, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Lewis Frederick Kosch, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Allender Swift, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Roy Samuel Gibson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Melvin Earl Gillette, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Tom Christopher Rives, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).
- ×Lt. Col. Andrew Raymond Reeves, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. William Frederic Marquat, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general).
- Lt. Col. Allison Ware Jones, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Howard Herndon Davis, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. George Eitle Hartman, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Philip Frederick Biehl, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. James Gasper Devine, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Howard Nathaniel Frissell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Edward Allen Everitt, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Robert Hughes Lord, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. Mose Kent, Infantry (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Harry William Maas, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Francis Henry Boucher, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. William Henry Sweet, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
- Lt. Col. William Bentley Mayer, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
- ×Lt. Col. Harold Kernan, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Hubert Augustine McMorrow, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. William Robert Stickman, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Maximilian Clay, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Calvert Hinton Arnold, Signal Corps (temporary brigadier general).
 Lt. Col. Wilkie Collins Burt, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. George Leland Eberle, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
 X Lt. Col. Rufus Stanley Ramey, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Marcus Brenneman Bell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Louis Joseph Fortier, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Remington Orsinger, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. William Stewart Morris, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Richard Henry Ballard, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. James Clay Short, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. William Fred Lafrenz, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. John Deane Forsythe, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Lawrence Byron Wyant, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Leslie T. Lathrop, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. James Black Muir, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Ralph Hudson Wooten, Air Corps (temporary major general).
 X Lt. Col. Kenneth Burman Bush, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Charles Henry Keck, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. James Thomas Duke, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Thomas Watkins Ligon, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Edward Hale Brooks, Field Artillery (temporary major general).
 X Lt. Col. James David Brown, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Wayland Bixby Augur, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Harold Mark McClelland, Air Corps (temporary major general).
 X Lt. Col. William Brooks Bradford, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).
 X Lt. Col. Edmund Waring McLaren, Finance Department (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Abram Franklin Kibler, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
 X Lt. Col. Harold Clarkson Mabbott, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Lucas Elmendorf Schoonmaker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Gordon Marshall Wells, Ordnance Department (temporary brigadier general).
 Lt. Col. Don Carlos Faith, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Raymond Orr, Infantry.
 X Lt. Col. Clifford Dean Hindle, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Morrill Ross, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. John Averill Steere, Field Artillery.
 X Lt. Col. Leslie Edwards Babcock, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Francis Howard Wilson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Charles Swett Pettee, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. John Melville Sanderson, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Sidney Hamlet Negrotto, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. William Henry Egle Holmes, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Charles William Walton, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Ward Hale Maris, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

X Lt. Col. Hugh John FitzGerald, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Everett Langdon Upson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. James Paul Jacobs, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Paul Joseph Matte, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Murray Henry Ellis, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Ernest Cleveland Bomar, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Donovan Paul Yeuell, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Edward Benedict McCarthy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Leslie Frederick Lawrence, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Horace Waldo Forster, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Edwin Hubert Randle, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
 X Lt. Col. Simpson Ridley Stribling, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Waldemar Adolph Falck, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Carl John Rohsenberger, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. James Veto McDowell, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Harry Lee Hart, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. John Henry Gibson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. James Henry Beals Bogman, Signal Corps.
 Lt. Col. Percy Stuart Haydon, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Edwin Ernest Aldridge, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Edwin Blake Crabill, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Alfred Marston Shearer, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Halbert Hale Neilson, Cavalry.
 X Lt. Col. Raymond Frank Edwards, Infantry.
 X Lt. Col. Maurice Eugene Barker, Chemical Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Harold Glaucus Holt, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Robert Alexis McClure, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
 X Lt. Col. Norman John McMahon, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Paul Louis Singer, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Joseph Louis Ready, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Earl Coulson Flegel, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Herbert Blish Wheeler, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Wilbur Storn Elliott, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Kirke Brooks Lawton, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Neil Smith Edmond, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Harold Haney, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Martin DeWitt McAllister, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. William Henry Colbern, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
 X Lt. Col. John William Carroll, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Albert Barnett Jones, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Hamilton Thorn, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. David Cleveland Kelly, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Randolph Russell, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Edwin Miles Sumner, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Thomas Henry Green, Judge Advocate General's Department (The Judge Advocate General with rank of major general).

X Lt. Col. Donald Anderson Young, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Hans Charles Minuth, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Harold Putnam Detwiler, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Clarence Francis Hofstetter, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Charles Lawrence Bolté, Infantry (temporary major general).
 X Lt. Col. Theodore Francis Wessels, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Malcolm Fraser Lindsey, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Horace Oscar Cushman, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. William Maine Hutson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. David Henry Finley, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Vinton Lee James, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. William Franklin Campbell, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Henry Lester Barrett, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Archibald Donald Fiske, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Fenton Stratton Jacobs, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Raymond Rolland Tourtillott, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Lawrence Locke Clayton, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. William Mayer, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. James Laird Craig, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Ray Maxey Hare, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Charles Ernest Loucks, Chemical Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Herbert Vaughan Scanlan, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Russell Gordon Ayers, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Charles Hayden Owens, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Joseph William Loef, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Albert Dickinson Foster, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Donald Parker Spalding, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Ercil Dale Porter, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Harold Jack Adams, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. William Booth Van Aiken, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Archer Lynn Lerch, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary major general).
 X Lt. Col. Charles James Deahl, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Arcadi Gluckman, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Dale Milton Hoagland, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. James Polk Gammon, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Burton Curtis Andrus, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Arthur Lafayette Warren, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Irwin Lytle Lummis, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. David Lewis Ruffner, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Mark Milton Serrem, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Arthur William Gower, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. John Taylor Lewis, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major general).
 X Lt. Col. Ross Breckon Warren, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 X Lt. Col. Walter David Luplow, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

×Lt. Col. Samuel Lusker McCroskey, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Oliver Boone Bucher, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Clarence Ames Martin, Infantry (temporary major general).
 ×Lt. Col. Francis Stuart Swett, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Henning Linden, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Harold Taylor Brotherton, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Miles Whitney Kresge, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Ralph de Poix Terrell, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Walter Alexander Dumas, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Edwin Emerson Keatley, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Don Magruder Scott, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Robert Edward Wysor, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. James Harold Day, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. George William Outland, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. John Mead Silkman, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Loren Archibald Wetherby, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Bernard Butler McMahon, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. George Edwin Fingarson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 Lt. Col. Stanley Raymond Mickelsen, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Ernest Albert Rudelius, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. William Lee Blanton, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Thomas Brady, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Porter Pise Wiggins, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Gilbert Xavier Cheves, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. William Edward Corkill, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. John Thomas Zellars, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Emons Bert Whisner, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Hugh Tullock Mayberry, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Harry Staples Robertson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Andrew Jackson Wynne, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Olaf Phillips Winningstad, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Winfred Charles Green, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Marion Irwin Voorhes, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. George Van Wyck Pope, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. George Ellsworth Butler, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Joel Rankin Burney, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Milton Burton Persons, Signal Corps (temporary major general).
 ×Lt. Col. Homer Case, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Earl Cranston Ewert, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Bird Little, Infantry.
 ×Lt. Col. Guy Cummins McKinley, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Harold Hugh McClune, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Harold Pearson Gibson, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Gilbert Everhard Parker, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Francis Beeston Laurenson Myer, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. John George Murphy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

×Lt. Col. Gustave Villaret, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Edwin Sanders Van Deusen, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Joe Jene Miller, Signal Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. John Ernest Dahlquist, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
 ×Lt. Col. William Eugene Farthing, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).
 ×Lt. Col. Tom Sherman Brand, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. James Robinson Urquhart, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Morrill Watson Marston, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
 ×Lt. Col. William Edward Bergin, Adjutant General's Department (temporary brigadier general).
 ×Lt. Col. John Calvin Butner, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Edward Stanley Ott, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
 ×Lt. Col. Melvin Leslie McCreary, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Herman Hollie Felix Gossett, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Murray Matthews Montgomery, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Lester Johnson Whitlock, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
 ×Lt. Col. Harry Lee Campbell, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. John Kay Christmas, Ordnance Department (temporary brigadier general).
 ×Lt. Col. Harvey Edward, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Leo James McCarthy, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Ernest Arthur Williams, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. George Price Hays, Field Artillery (temporary major general).
 ×Lt. Col. Harry Squire Wilbur, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Ralph Julian Canine, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).
 ×Lt. Col. Timothy Asbury Pedley, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Donald Ross Dunkle, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Chester Earl Davis, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Edwin Turner Bowden, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Holmes Gill Paullin, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Ray Edison Porter, Infantry (temporary major general).
 ×Lt. Col. Clarence Clemons Park, Field Artillery (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Glenn Smith Finley, Cavalry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. William Volney Rattan, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Roswell Eric Hardy, Ordnance Department (temporary brigadier general).
 ×Lt. Col. Lloyd Zuppann, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. John Kirkland Rice, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).
 ×Lt. Col. James Holden Hagan, Infantry (temporary colonel).
 ×Lt. Col. Charles Spurgeon Johnson, Infantry (temporary colonel).

NOTE.—Dates of rank are omitted from this nomination. The first 349 nominees to be promoted will be given date of rank as December 28, 1945, to fill original vacancies authorized by Public Law 281, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved December 28, 1945. The remaining nominees will be given dates of rank appropriate to the vacancies they will fill. The dates of rank are omitted in order to assure that 349 officers may be promoted to fill the vacancies authorized by Public Law 281. If any of these officers should retire or die prior to promotion it would necessitate renominating the remaining officers in order to change their dates of rank to correspond with the vacancies.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of Glory shall come in. Who is this King of Glory? The Lord of Hosts, He is the King of Glory.

O Conqueror, Thou who cometh in the name of the Lord, who didst go through the rejoicing multitude to a hill where stood a cross, make us, we beseech Thee, sharers in thy devoted spirit, as we remember the glory of Thy triumphant entry. Give us the faith which supported Thee and led Thee onward in Thine appointed mission. By gentleness, by selfless service, help us to breathe Thy spirit and interpret to men Thy rule of life, to the end that the kingdom of God may come upon the earth and be exalted in human hearts and homes. In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 28, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to provide for the printing and distribution of certain matter relating to congressional activities, authorized by section 221 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Department of the Treasury.
6. Federal Security Agency.
7. Federal Works Agency.
8. National Archives.
9. Railroad Retirement Board.
10. Tennessee Valley Authority.

OFFICE OF SELECTIVE SERVICE RECORDS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

MARCH 29, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the special order agreed to yesterday, the Clerk did on this day receive from the Secretary of the Senate a message in writing attesting to the fact that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 918) entitled "An act to establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective

Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the selective-service records, and for other purposes."

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

MARCH 28, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the special order agreed to today, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate the engrossed bill of the House of Representatives (H. J. Res. 159) entitled "Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes," attested by the Secretary as having passed the Senate without amendment March 28 (legislative day of March 24), 1947.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on March 28, 1947, examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On March 28, 1947:

H. R. 1240. An act to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard; and

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted him on Friday, March 28, 1947, he signed enrolled bills and joint resolutions as follows:

On March 28, 1947:

H. R. 1240. An act to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard;

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and

On March 29, 1947:

S. 918. An act to establish an Office of Selective Service Records to liquidate the Selective Service System following the termination of its functions on March 31, 1947, and to preserve and service the selective service records, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. Owing to the fact that a conference report must be passed on in the House as early as possible in

order that it may go to the Senate and become law today, the Chair feels that 1-minute speeches and requests for extensions must wait until after the disposition of this conference report.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY WITH RESPECT TO DISTRIBUTION AND PRICING OF SUGAR

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the resolution (H. J. Res. 146) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that this statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That (a) notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 23); the Stabilization Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 765); title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 177), and the amendment to existing law made thereby; title XIV of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (56 Stat. 177); and section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), all as amended and extended, shall continue in effect with respect to sugar to and including October 31, 1947, except that authority to continue inventory controls over other than household users may be exercised to and including March 31, 1948: *Provided, however, That—*

"(1) the authority contained herein shall not be deemed (i) to permit the allocation or rationing of any product (other than the allocation of such product imported or brought into the continental United States) unless a regulation providing for allocation or rationing thereof was in effect on February 18, 1947, or (ii) to permit price control over any product unless a price-control regulation with respect thereto was in effect on February 18, 1947;

"(2) no person shall be subject to any criminal penalty or civil liability, under any provision of law referred to above, on account of any act or omission which is made unlawful by section 4 of this Act;

"(3) no provision of section 204 (d) or (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall apply (i) in any proceeding, involving a regulation or order with respect to sugar, in which an injunction of other order of a court is hereafter applied for, or (ii) in any proceeding, under section 37 of the Criminal Code, which is based on a conspiracy involving any act or omission which is made unlawful by section 4 of this Act;

"(4) in the case of any regulation or order with respect to sugar, no protest may be hereafter filed under section 203 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; and

"(5) hereafter no person shall be required to secure a license, and no license shall be issued to any person, under section 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, for the purpose of providing for the enforcement of any regulation or order relating to sugar.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture, in exercising the powers, functions, and duties transferred to him by section 3 of this Act,—

"(1) may allocate sugar without regard to the provisions of title II of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 787);

"(2) shall allocate refined sugar for home consumption at a rate of not less than thirty-five pounds per capita per calendar year, and any increase in the amount of sugar available for allocation in the calendar year 1947 over the amount recommended by the International Emergency Food Council for allocation to the United States for 1947 shall be allocated for home consumption until the allocation for such use equals fifty pounds of refined sugar per capita; and

"(3) shall, in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program, make available, for other than provisional-allocation users, not less than 12,500 tons of refined sugar during the period from the date of the enactment of this Act to and including June 30, 1947, and not less than 12,500 tons of refined sugar during the period from July 1, 1947, to and including October 31, 1947, to provide for the needs of hardship cases, for the needs of new industrial-sugar users (with particular reference to the needs of shortage areas caused by population shifts) and for the needs of those who have an insufficient base period history to operate currently at competitive levels (and shall consider, as a determining factor in those cases where there is such insufficient base period history, the rate of growth of such user prior to the base period year).

"Sec. 2. Prior to the expiration of the authority granted by this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to remove any or all controls with respect to any product over which control is authorized by this Act when he determines that the supplies of sugar are sufficient to warrant such action.

"Sec. 3. (a) The powers, functions, and duties of (1) the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment to existing law made thereby; (2) the President or any executive department under section 6 of the Act of July 2, 1940; (3) the Price Administrator under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; and (4) the President and the Price Administrator under the Stabilization Act of 1942, all as amended and extended (and irrespective of what officer, department, or agency may be now exercising any such power, function, or duty) are, insofar as they relate to sugar, hereby transferred to and shall be executed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(b) Every order, directive, rule or regulation relating to any power, function, or duty transferred by subsection (a) of this section, issued by any officer, department, or agency heretofore performing such power, function, or duty, which is not in conflict with the provisions of this Act and which is in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall continue in full force and effect, according to its terms, unless and until modified or rescinded by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(c) So much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds, and the property, available for the use of any officer, department, or agency in the exercise of any power, function, or duty transferred by subsection (a) of this section or for the use of the Secretary of Agriculture in the exercise of any power, function, or duty so transferred, as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine, shall be transferred for use in connection with the exercise of such powers, functions, or duties. In determining the amount to be transferred, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may include an amount to provide for the liquidation of obligations incurred against such balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds prior to the transfer. Such personnel as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines to be required may also be transferred temporarily to the Department of Agriculture pending termination of the powers, functions, and duties transferred by subsection (a) of this section. The annual and sick leave of personnel so transferred shall be transferred with them; and they shall be entitled to the benefits of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to the same extent and effect as though they had remained employees of the agency from which transferred until the termination of such powers, functions, and duties. Any personnel so transferred shall not, by virtue of their temporary employment in the Department of Agriculture, acquire or be entitled to any right to employment in such Department in connection with the exercise of any power, function, or duty other than one transferred under this Act. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to do or omit to do any act, in violation of any order, directive, rule, or regulation continued in effect by section 3 (b) of this Act or issued in the exercise of any power, function, or duty transferred by section 3 (a) of this Act.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of the Government, or for any adviser or consultant to the Secretary of Agriculture in his official capacity, to disclose, otherwise than in the course of official duty, any information obtained under this Act, or to use any such information, for personal benefit.

"(c) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than two years in the case of a violation of subsection (b) and for not more than one year in all other cases, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

"Sec. 5. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing, and includes the United States or any agency thereof, or any other government, or any of its political subdivisions, or any agency of any of the foregoing: *Provided*, That no punishment provided by this Act shall apply to the United States, or to any such government, political subdivision, or agency.

"(b) The term 'sugar' means any grade or type of saccharine product derived from sugarcane, sugar beets, or corn, including liquid sugar, sirups, molasses, or mixtures thereof, and sugar-containing products, which contain sucrose, dextrose, or levulose.

"Sec. 6. (a) Section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'Surplus Property Act of 1944,' the following: 'Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947;'

"(b) This Act may be cited as the 'Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
CHARLES W. TOBEY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommend in the accompanying conference report:

The substitute agreed to in conference is similar in most respects to the joint resolution as it passed the House but there are differences which are explained below in this statement.

Section 1 of the joint resolution as passed by the House, after providing for temporary continuance of specified provisions of law, included the following provision:

"(2) no person shall be subject to any criminal penalty or civil liability, under any such provision of law, on account of any act or omission which is made unlawful by section 4 of this Act;"

In the conference substitute the words "under any provision of law referred to above" have been used instead of the words "under any such provision of law". This change is merely to make it perfectly clear that the provisions of law referred to are the ones cited in the introductory language to section 1.

Section 1 of the joint resolution passed by the House contained a subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Agriculture, in exercising the allocation and rationing authority transferred to him by section 3 of this Act, shall in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program, provide for the needs of hardship cases, for the needs of new sugar users, and for the needs of those who have no base period history."

This provision has been omitted from the conference substitute, but in lieu thereof provisions have been included providing that the Secretary of Agriculture, in exercising the powers, functions, and duties transferred to him by section 3 of the act, (1) may allocate sugar without regard to the provisions of title II of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944; and (2) shall, in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program, make available for other than provisional-allotment users, not less than 12,500 tons of refined sugar during the period from the date of the enactment of this act to and including June 30, 1947, and not less than 12,500 tons of refined sugar during the period from July 1, 1947, to and including October 31, 1947, to provide for the needs of hardship cases, new industrial-sugar users (with particular reference to the needs of shortage areas caused by population shifts) and for the needs of those who have an insufficient base period history to operate currently at competitive levels (and shall consider, as a

determining factor in those cases where there is such insufficient base period history, the rate of growth of such user prior to the base period year).

The provision referred to in clause (1) of the preceding paragraph is taken from the Senate amendment, and merely makes more specific the intent of one of the provisions of the House joint resolution which is omitted from the conference substitute. The provision referred to in clause (2) of the preceding paragraph is a modification of section 4 of the Senate amendment. That section provided that the Secretary of Agriculture should make available not less than 50,000 tons of refined sugar, for other than provisional-allotment users, during the period from April 1, 1947, to March 31, 1948, to provide for the same needs (other than the needs of hardship cases) which are to be provided for under the provision of the conference substitute here being discussed. The reduction from 50,000 to 25,000 tons made by this provision is in consideration of the fact that the amount referred to in the Senate amendment would have been allocated over a full year, whereas the provision in the conference substitute makes provision for a period from the date of the enactment of this act until October 31, 1947. In providing that the Secretary of Agriculture shall make such sugar available in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program, and in making provision for hardship cases, this provision of the conference substitute follows the provision of the House joint resolution.

It is the intention that the Secretary, in exercising his allocation powers under this legislation, shall make just and reasonable provision for meeting need for sugar to avoid wastage of milk and other food products. The conferees are confident that such provision will be made because of assurances given to the Senate committee and referred to in the report of that committee on Senate Joint Resolution 58.

There is also included in the conference substitute a provision taken from the Senate amendment requiring that the Secretary of Agriculture in exercising the powers, functions, and duties transferred to him shall allocate refined sugar for home consumption at a rate of not less than 35 pounds per capita per calendar year, and any increase in the amount of sugar available for allocation in the calendar year 1947 over the amount recommended by the International Emergency Food Council for allocation to the United States for 1947 shall be allocated for home consumption until the allocation for such use equals 50 pounds of refined sugar per capita.

Section 1 of the joint resolution as passed by the House contained the following subsection which is omitted from the conference substitute:

"(c) Nothing herein shall restrict the import of products of consumer size containers of not more than three pounds net each or more than one-half United States liquid gallons each, providing importers of such products shall obtain certification from the proper government officials of the exporting country that products so shipped shall have been produced out of domestic quota sugar."

In that part of section 3 of the joint resolution as passed by the House, which dealt with the temporary transfer of employees, the following proviso was included:

"*Provided*, That nothing in this section shall in anywise be construed to violate any of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944."

In lieu of this proviso there has been included in the conference substitute the following provision taken substantially from the Senate amendment:

"The annual and sick leave of personnel so transferred shall be transferred with them; and they shall be entitled to the benefits of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to the same extent and effect as though they had remained employees of the agency from which transferred until the termination of such powers, functions and duties. Any personnel so transferred shall not, by virtue of their temporary employment in the Department of Agriculture, acquire or be entitled to any right to employment in such Department in connection with the exercise of any power, function, or duty other than one transferred under this Act."

Section 6 of the conference substitute makes an amendment to the Administrative Procedure Act so as to continue, with respect to the exercise of the authority transferred by this legislation, the exemption from such act which is now applicable in the case of the exercise of such authority. This section also provides that this act may be cited as the "Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947."

The Senate amendment contained a subsection 3 (d) providing for continuance in effect of orders, directives, rules, and regulations, pertaining to sugar, for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or proceeding with respect to violations, liabilities, or appeals. This provision has been omitted from the conference substitute solely on the ground that it was deemed unnecessary. By other provisions of the conference substitute orders, directives, rules, and regulations pertaining to sugar are continued in effect, and there is nothing in the conference substitute which would prevent them from being in effect for the purposes referred to in the Senate section 3 (d). Furthermore, section 13 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., supp. V, title 1, section 29) provides that—

"The repeal of any statute shall not have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under such statute, unless the repealing Act shall expressly so provide, and such statute shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper action or prosecution for the enforcement of such penalty, forfeiture, or liability. The expiration of a temporary statute shall not have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under such statute, unless the temporary statute shall so expressly provide, and such statute shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper action or prosecution for the enforcement of such penalty, forfeiture, or liability."

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House discloses that about the only changes from the House bill are in the interest of clarity. The bill as adopted by the conferees is substantially the bill as it passed the House.

Some questions have arisen as to whether sugar will be made available to new users, those without a sufficient base period, and hardship cases. The conferees have agreed that the Secretary of Agriculture should make sugar available to new users, to those without a base period, and for the needs of hardship cases in a manner consistent with the maintenance of an effective national allocation and rationing program. In order

that there might be no question that the Secretary of Agriculture should make available sugar for canning purposes, and for the prevention of spoilage and wastage of food, you will find on page 6 of the conference report, in the statement of the managers on the part of the House, substantially the same language as was contained in the House report, which clearly defines the intent of the Congress to making sugar available to prevent spoilage and wastage of food, in which it provides:

It is the intention that the Secretary, in exercising his allocation powers under this legislation, shall make just and reasonable provision for meeting need for sugar to avoid wastage of milk and other food products.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I was interested in that language contained on page 6 of the conference report. May I ask the gentleman if the sugar to be allocated under the Secretary's authority is a part of the 25,000 tons referred to in the previous paragraph, or is that in addition to the 25,000 tons?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The sugar made available under the 25,000 tons is for provisional use, and it is my interpretation that the amount of sugar made available for hardship cases and new users is in addition to and not a part of the 25,000 tons.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us what the per capita amount of refined sugar is that is now being used by the people.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think, perhaps, I will have to divide that answer in two different parts. It is expected that this year there will be about 93 pounds available per capita as against a normal of 103 pounds. Now, that is for all domestic purposes, commercial as well as household purposes. Last year there was allocated 25 pounds per capita per annum. Under the estimate made for this year which, as I said, is within 10 pounds per capita of normal production, there is no question at all but that the householder shall be allocated at least 35 pounds per capita. The Senate wrote a provision in here that sugar should be allocated to household users on the basis of not less than 35 pounds per capita, and that any increase in the estimate should be allocated to the household users up to 50 pounds per capita. They did not have to do that. It might be a redundancy, but is an added protection which assures that each consumer, for household purposes, separate and apart from industrial purposes, shall get at least 35 pounds per capita. They possibly will get 50 pounds per capita, and perhaps more than that.

I do not think this sugar problem, Mr. Speaker, is nearly as serious as we have presumed. We are getting along splendidly, and I think one of our problems next year is going to be—I hope next year, anyway—that we will have so much sugar that there will not be any question of

rationing; it will be a question of getting rid of the surplus.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Is my understanding correct that if we are allocated 50 pounds and it can be proven that we cannot put up our fruits with the 50 pounds allocated to us we are entitled to have more sugar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is very clearly the intention of the Congress that every possible attempt should be made to provide not only any additional sugars which are available but any sugar which is necessary to prevent wastage and spoilage. Of course we intend that there shall be made available adequate sugar for preventing wastage and spoilage of foods.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. If I understand this conference report correctly, you continue the rationing of sugar until October 31 of this year. Then you continue the inventory control over sugar until next March.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. Control over commercial and industrial inventories is permitted until March 31, 1948.

Mr. RIZLEY. Following the question of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], may I inquire who makes the determination as to whether the housewife who needs more than 50 pounds of sugar for canning shall have the sugar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. RIZLEY. Has the Secretary of Agriculture now a set-up in his office to take over the handling and control of sugar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We provide for the transfer of appropriations and personnel to him, subject to the approval of the Director of the Budget.

Mr. RIZLEY. In other words, you take the present employees of the OPA, or whatever its successor was, and transfer them to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of further rationing and allocating the sugar up until October 31?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In practice it will be whether the Secretary of Agriculture wants them and whether the Bureau of the Budget will certify them as necessary, but I may say to the gentleman that the problem we have had has not been with the clerks and stenographers of OPA, it has been on the policy-making level, at the top. From now on, the policies with respect to the allocation and pricing of sugar will be under the direct control of the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Clinton Anderson, in whom I think we have more confidence than we have had in the administrators of OPA.

Mr. RIZLEY. There is one other question I should like to ask the gentleman from Michigan, who has been very familiar with the whole rationing program from the beginning. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he observed that he did not think this sugar question is now nearly as serious as a lot of people seem to think it is.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think it is becoming decreasingly serious every day. I did not want to indicate that there is no serious sugar shortage now.

Mr. RIZLEY. In view of that statement, that it is not as serious as a lot of people seem to think it is, does not the gentleman believe the time is about here when we can get rid of these controls put on by virtue of the war? If it is not a serious matter, does not the gentleman believe it would be a pretty good idea to give the housewives of the country a little relief by just doing away with this thing now, in its entirety instead of continuing it on piecemeal, part of it until October 31 and the balance of it up until March 1948?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is just the problem. Because there is a world shortage of sugar at the present time, if we were to remove controls at the present time, it is very doubtful whether the housewife would be getting much sugar 30 days from now. We would invite competition between the commercial and industrial users and the housewife to the prejudice of household users. It is for the purpose of assuring the housewife that she is going to get an equitable supply of sugar that we are continuing this program until October 31, with the hope that production will be sufficient by that time to allow the controls to come off in an orderly manner without too much shock to our sugar industry and that part of the economy which is more or less dependent on sugar.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is the excuse the controllers always give, shortage. We will continue to have shortages so long as we attempt to control our economy by New Deal planners. And so long as we continue to attempt to feed the whole world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I inquire of the gentleman if his committee is watching the present price situation as it affects consumers generally with a view to taking action unless there is a reduction in the cost of living?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We are watching it with tremendous interest.

Mr. McCORMACK. With the intention of taking action, if necessary, for the protection of the consumers' interest?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If it is necessary; but I think industry is taking the action which is necessary to bring about reduced prices.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice they are failing to cooperate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Industry is producing goods more rapidly at the present time than they ever produced before even in wartime. Industry is producing goods so rapidly in the United States today that our capacity for production really amazes us. One of the greatest problems today in many lines is the question of markets for our surplus production. That involves a great danger and that is why the gentleman and myself gave some consideration to making foreign credit available so that when we have these surpluses, probably this year and next year, we will have markets for them.

Mr. McCORMACK. My purpose originally in asking the gentleman to yield was in connection with the October 31st date. That is based upon the hope that

there will be such an increase in production that there will be no sharp increase in price levels.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the purposes of the record, would we be able to ascertain by early July whether or not that hope will materialize so far as production is concerned?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know that we would be able to determine that with any degree of definiteness in July and perhaps not before August or September. But the date of October 31 is predicated upon the fact that the world-crop figures will then be pretty well known, and we will know just about what the domestic crop is going to amount to. So that, by October 31, if we have even a normal year this year, it is thought that we can safely take controls off.

I do not think we can tell definitely by July because many things might happen between July and September. By the latter part of August or the fore part of September, we should know within a few hundred thousand tons about how much sugar is going to be available in the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. I recognize the situation and, of course, the conference report should be agreed to. But the thought I had in mind was that if there was a rapid increase in the cost of living, we would have to take some action for the protection of consumers somehow or other along this line. Is that a fair inference to draw?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Perhaps so, but I do not think the danger lies so much in an abnormal increase in the price of sugar. When controls come off in October, even if we are still in reasonably short supply, sugar will be coming on the market, so shortly after the danger would lie more in the fact that the commercial and industrial users might bid for the available supplies to the prejudice of the housewife. That is the reason why we kept this provision here for the permissive control of inventories so that the Secretary of Agriculture can say to an industrial user of sugar, "You usually keep a 60-day supply of sugar on hand and, therefore, you should not have more than a 60-day supply of sugar on hand until March 31, 1948."

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was in my district on Saturday and Sunday. Family after family said to me, "We have no sugar in our sugar bowls." I assured them that I believed it was the feeling of the chairman of the committee that there would be more sugar for canning and more sugar available, and that there must be more sugar than was anticipated because Dr. Marshall, of the Department of Agriculture, promised me before this legislation was introduced that the farmers would be given their regular supply of sugar to be used to make condensed milk out of their skimmed milk. Apparently, therefore, there is more sugar than was anticipated. But I know the gentleman is working on that. I voted rather reluctantly to

retain controls until October 31, but I had faith in the gentleman and his committee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We did stress the necessity for making sugar available to prevent food wastage and spoilage. I may say the family sugar bowls will be replenished tomorrow. I think there is another stamp made valid tomorrow.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman usually gets what he goes after.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I thank the lady from Massachusetts.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Is there any relief in this bill for retail dealers in sugar who have had their stamps lost or stolen, to the end that they cannot supply their customers with even a small supply of sugar at the present time? What, if anything, has been done about a situation of that nature?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think there is a little relief, at least, to them in subsection (2) of section (b), on page 2 of the conference report, where provision is made for the needs of hardship cases, needs of new industrial users, and then in parentheses you will find this language:

With particular reference to the needs of shortage areas caused by population shifts.

The retailer would have too little sugar for two reasons: Because he has lost his stamps, because he perhaps has cashed counterfeit stamps, but that in itself would be a hardship case which the Secretary of Agriculture would have to give consideration to. Then, if in a town where there are perhaps only two grocery stores which has had an unusual increase in population, due to population shift, throwing an added burden on those two grocers, that condition would have to be considered as creating a hardship, and the Secretary of Agriculture would have to give consideration to the needs of that community. In that manner the retail grocers would have their allotments increased proportionate as the population has increased.

Mr. JENSEN. Then the gentleman does feel there is some relief in this bill in the case which I have mentioned?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; if it is properly administered, there will be substantial relief, and I am certain it will be properly administered.

Mr. JENSEN. I received this morning a petition from several hundred housewives in the city of Shenandoah, Iowa, and the surrounding community, in which they point out very carefully that they are worried about the sugar condition, and that sugar is very short at the present time. I understood the gentleman to say it was not a very serious situation at the present time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think it is becoming less serious every day.

Mr. JENSEN. But will this thing be straightened out in time to take care of the canning season—that is, the canning of fruit in the country?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. The housewife will be much better off with this bill than she would be without it.

Mr. JENSEN. Categorically, just how much better off do you think she will be?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In the first place, she will be assured of 10 pounds, per capita, more than she had last year, with the hope that if the sugar production is as it is estimated, somewhat better than normal, she will get up to 50 pounds as against 25 pounds last year. She will get that between now and October at that rate. Then, on October 31, all controls go off, and I hope she will be able to get all the sugar she will want after that date. There is some canning to be done, of course, at that time. It runs into November, I understand, although I quite agree that most canning is done before that. But most of the canning this year will be done at a time when sugar is under control, having the effect of guaranteeing that she will get much more sugar than she got last year.

Mr. JENSEN. And getting it soon—in plenty of time for canning, say within the next month or two?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We hope so. I think the fact that they are giving the housewives a little bonus on tomorrow, April 1, indicates that they realize that the sugar situation will be better than that which existed 2 or 3 months ago.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. From the realistic standpoint, I understand the gentleman to say that the Secretary of Agriculture will make additional allocations to prevent wastage. How does that apply to the housewife or someone who wants to use sugar to can fruit to prevent its going to waste? The individual cannot take it up with the Secretary of Agriculture. Are we going to have an OPA in the communities to determine this additional allocation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We are not going to have any more OPA as far as sugar is concerned.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Where is the housewife going to get in touch with the Secretary of Agriculture to get this allocation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Secretary of Agriculture probably will not deal with the individual housewife.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. How is she going to get the additional sugar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. He will deal generally with the problem when it arises. If there is not sugar available to meet the needs for preserving food at the time of its harvest the Secretary of Agriculture will know the needs of the housewives and then he will make arrangements to validate coupons for increased amounts of sugar.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. What I am trying to get at is, How is the housewife to get this additional allocation to prevent the wastage of her fruit as it ripens?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Through directive or order of the Secretary of Agriculture which will be applicable generally to all household users.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Then it applies only to a class?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right, the whole class of consumers throughout the

United States in the class of household users.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. That will not aid the individual housewife.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I believe it will; she will get as much as anybody else. It will aid the gentleman's wife just as it will aid my wife.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Then we have this problem, the stores right here in Washington are full of sugar but there are no stamps, there are no pass-words or anything to enable consumers to get the sugar. That is true all over the country.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Stamps for additional amounts of sugar will be validated tomorrow.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. They must have anticipated this; is that right?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; they anticipated that there would be demand for the sugar. The fact that grocers, wholesale and retail, have adequate stocks of sugar on hand at the present time indicates that if we did not have this rationing at this time there would not be any sugar in the warehouses. Everybody would buy all the sugar as fast as they possibly could to the prejudice of the late comer. That is the reason for having it in the hands of grocers, so as to have a stock to meet the demand next week and the week following. You might just as well say that because the warehouses in Michigan are stocked today we should do away with rationing entirely; but we do not know what is going to happen 3 months from now. If we did not have rationing probably no housewife would have much sugar then.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. And the continuation of inventory controls does enable the Secretary of Agriculture to continue the sugar control, although, as the gentleman says, only as to wholesalers or dealers.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. The gentleman will remember that I offered an amendment on the floor to continue those controls only to nonhousehold users. It applies only to nonhousehold users. In conference we were very insistent that that provision stay in the bill. There was no trouble among the conferees in that respect.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Then we can rest assured that we are not going to have a continuation of the New Deal control and planned economy in reference to sugar rationing?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is my hope.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. Am I correct in assuming that inventory control after October 31 also means use control?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No.

Mr. BUCK. Then what is to prevent a person who has laid in a 60-day inventory from using it at a greatly accelerated rate, replacing his inventory the next day? I do not see how you can have effective control if you do not have use control along with the inventory control.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman mean would a commercial user be allowed to expand?

Mr. BUCK. Expand his consumption,

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the Secretary of Agriculture probably would take an average over a period of time to determine what that man's current needs or that industry's current needs were, and if he had, we will say, 20 tons of sugar in his warehouse on the average and he was replenishing that and keeping 20 tons in there, perhaps a normal 30-day supply, the Secretary of Agriculture would say: "You can have no more than 20 tons or a 30-day supply." He would have to use it out of his incoming sugar.

Mr. BUCK. Then control after October 31 does involve consumption control? It must, to be effective.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of volume use; yes.

Mr. BUCK. Yes. Will the gentleman explain how the Department of Agriculture is going to police that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That has not been worked out. It is a question of administration. Frankly, I may say it is one of our purposes to get rid of the cumbersome administrative machinery we now have. The Government should be encouraged to simplify control, or the enforcement of sugar control; so I think that is a problem which might well be left to the Appropriations Committee, the question as to how much of a staff it will give the Secretary of Agriculture to enforce it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am afraid the RECORD will show something I do not believe should be in this. Inventory control, as I understand this bill, does not prevent manufacturer A, for instance, from using 40 tons of sugar instead of 20 tons of sugar. Your rationing goes off on October 31. The Secretary cannot ration sugar subsequent to that date, but he can say, "You, Mr. Wholesaler B, can have on your floor no more than a 60-day supply of sugar at a time." You are in a free market so far as purchases are concerned. So when you reduce your inventory of sugar to a 30-day supply, if the rule is 60 days, you can go in the market and buy another 30-day supply of sugar, whether you are a manufacturer or a wholesaler. The point is, you must not have on your floor or in inventory sugar in excess of what the Secretary of Agriculture says you may have. Is that not the right interpretation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think in practice it is, but you have this additional protection: Every industrial and commercial user might expect when price control is off of sugar that there will be an immediate reaction in the prices. Prices may immediately go up; yet he knows also from experience that prices will very shortly afterward come back down perhaps below what they were before controls were taken off. So he is not going to stock unusually large inventories of sugar at high prices which he will have to sell for less than he paid for it. That controls very much these inventories and I do not think we need to worry too much about that. They have to go into the open market, and inasmuch as they cannot increase their inventories the only way they could use a disproportionate

amount of sugar would be to expand their production, which is probably now at capacity. So the two influences are against unusually large inventories. One, they will not have equipment to expand or to use so much sugar as to prejudice the needs of the householder; and second, it would not be very good business on their part to buy in a high-price market and sell in a few weeks in a low-price market.

Mr. BUCK. If a particular manufacturer doubled his output on November 1, then he would be permitted to have double the amount of inventory?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. It would be under regulation. He could not start to build up those inventories. It would be under control. He would have to build his inventories before the controls went off, and he could not do that under the rationing system.

Mr. BUCK. How often could he replace his inventory?

Mr. WOLCOTT. As often as it was necessary to maintain it at his average level, I presume. That would be under regulation also.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. When this bill was before the House we amended it to provide that nothing in it would be construed to violate any of the provisions of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, and I note the conference report has some wording different from that. Would the gentleman explain that to us and assure us that it is at least the equivalent of what we passed?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. We did not think when we wrote the language in here that authorized the transfer temporarily of these employees that there would be any question but that the word "temporarily" modified the length of service and not the status of the individual. The Civil Service Commission, however, gave an interpretation which indicated there was some doubt in their minds as to whether it went to the status of the individual or to his employment. To clarify the fact that we did not intend by this transfer to interfere in any manner with the Civil Service status of the employee transferred, we substituted the language at the top of page 7 for the language that we had in the House bill. This positively assures that the civil service status of the employee transferred will in no way be affected.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The conference report guarantees each consumer 35 pounds of sugar for this year, as I understand. We are dealing now with the question of supply, because our sugar has been produced and is now being refined, and there will be very little more available from the 1947 production until after these controls go off, so we are dealing with the question of distributing the supply which we have on hand and which is now being refined in Cuba.

I think it should be pointed out that we secure approximately 40 percent of

our sugar from Cuba to take care of the needs of the American people. The Cuban production will be approximately 1,500,000 tons greater for this crop year than it was for last year. Now, the committee report holds out some hope to the consumers of this Nation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Does the gentleman give that figure advisedly?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That figure of 1,500,000 is the Department's figure; that is the Cuban figure. Everybody in industry has said it would be more than that, so I will take the Department's estimate on that. But what I want to point out is this: I do not think we should hold out a false hope that the housewives, the consumers, will each get 50 pounds of sugar because as I see it it is entirely dependent on what the International Emergency Food Council does with the consent of our administration in distributing that extra sugar from Cuba to other countries of the world.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Excepting that the Emergency Food Council has already allocated the estimated increase of Cuban production.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, that is 1,500,000 tons. In the last 30 days the Cubans estimate that they will have five or six hundred thousand tons more than the January estimate. Now, I say this: That the American people are entitled to that extra five or six hundred thousand tons from Cuba, which will give them at least 5 pounds more sugar, to make it 40 pounds instead of 35 pounds, and also give some more to industrial users. Our Food Committee has made that request to the Secretary of Agriculture—that he will give that extra 5 pounds to the American consumers, which will give us 40 pounds instead of 35 pounds.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I wish the gentleman's Food Study Committee would continue to stress the point which the gentleman has just made—that it is the intention of Congress that any increase in the Cuban crop production should be reflected in proportionate increases in the available supply of sugar in the United States to effectuate our purpose that the housewife will get up to 50 pounds of sugar.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We will do that, and we know we will have the help of the gentleman and other Members of Congress. But I want to point out that if the International Food Council, with the consent of the administration, decides to give that five or six hundred thousand tons to other countries of the world, then we will not get more than 35 pounds.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. There has been a good deal of talk about dates. It is regrettable that the bill is not in the form in which it was originally introduced by the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of our committee. There is no significance to the October 31 date except that that is the period when we hope the crop will be marketed and be ready for distribution, that is, it will be on

the way. The impression is that the gentleman from Michigan introduced a bill which extended controls to March 31, 1948. That is a false impression. His bill provided that on October 31 of this year the controls should end unless the Secretary of Agriculture should make a finding that this commodity continued in short supply, which is quite a different provision from the categorical ending of controls on a given date.

The point I want to make, and I make this comment chiefly from the standpoint of improving our legislative craftsmanship, is that Congress ought not to leave this situation in that condition, and the country ought not to be under any false impressions as to the possibilities that may confront us on October 31. There was a rather hopeful picture of the sugar situation presented by Dr. Marshall, who apparently knows a great deal about the situation. He said if growing continues, if the weather is favorable, there will be perhaps one of the finest crops not only in Cuba but in all parts of the world, and to that extent we can have a rather optimistic view of the future; but because of the action not only of this body but of the other body we are now left exposed to that potential hazard.

May I say in commendation of the chairman's action in that respect that I hope Congress will legislate with greater skill on situations of this kind and not walk away from the condition hopefully asserting that the crop will be abundant. If it is not abundant, we are going to have a situation between October 31 and January 1, when Congress reconvenes, that cannot be remedied by any action by any authority that we have placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I simply wanted to say with reference to the chairman's action that I thought the pattern which he laid out in his original bill is one that we ought to follow. It would hold the power in the hands of Congress and not turn us over to the cold processes of economic law, which have a way of bringing disaster. Certainly we do not want a repetition in the sugar situation of the condition that we had after the other war, when prices skyrocketed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am very grateful to the gentleman for his very valuable contribution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This measure carries with it the right to fix prices of sugar?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The truth of the business is that sugar is being shipped from Cuba to other countries because it is higher in other countries in terms of our own money than it is in the United States. This measure is not going to cure anything. It reminds me of the fellow who wanted to fill up the empty barrel by pouring water in at the bung-hole with both ends knocked out. Here we are in a monetary inflation. I call attention again to the fact that it is the duty of the Committee on Banking and Currency to do something about it.

This is not doing a thing in the world but perpetuating until October 31 a control that should have been taken off long ago. If we will take these controls entirely off, there will be enough sugar coming to the United States, and produced in the United States, to supply the entire demand. As long as you keep this price fixing on you are going to have the same condition and the same reaction from the American people.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman is in substantial accord with the majority thinking of the Committee on Banking and Currency, except, of course, that we do have export controls and we do allocate the world supply of sugar throughout the world under the International Emergency Food Council; so the statement which the gentleman made that the bulk of the sugar is moving to foreign countries because of better price, in view of the exchange conditions at the present time, probably is not warranted.

I think we are all looking toward the same end as the gentleman. That is surely in keeping with the principle which the gentleman announces. I know the committee will follow through because it is our impression that we should remove these controls just as quickly as we possibly can.

Mr. RANKIN. I am informed that all the sugar that is produced in Cuba and other countries is to be shipped anywhere except the United States, as long as we hold this price down, while our currency is inflated, from less than \$5,000,000,000 to almost \$30,000,000,000. Unless we attempt to restrict inflation of the currency, we are going to keep the American people from getting the amount of sugar they need.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman might be misinformed. We buy the entire exportable Cuban sugar crop and accept an allocation under the agreement with the International Emergency Food Council.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I brought up a point during the previous debate on this bill regarding towns that have had an unusual increase in population. The situation with reference to that has been made much clearer by the wording of this bill. The responsibility for meeting that situation is squarely in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think that situation will be somewhat helped.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. How soon will he be able to put this program as outlined in the present bill into effective operation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Theoretically, tonight at 12:01 a. m.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. And all appeals should be made to him directly?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I have one other situation in mind. Suppose a bakery is starting out in a rather large town, and there is no historic basis for the allocation of sugar; that is, a new bakery and there is no other bakery serving that community. That would come

squarely within section 1 of this bill also?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is my impression that it would definitely come under that.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The Secretary of Agriculture has authority under section 1 to grant authority to a new bakery serving a community exclusively to furnish them sugar immediately?

Mr. WOLCOTT. He has very wide authority in that respect.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Just a moment ago the gentleman from Mississippi made some reference to the duty or obligation upon the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in connection with this matter.

Mr. RANKIN. I meant to say the Committee on Banking and Currency. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. WOLCOTT. When I answered the gentleman from Mississippi I did so having in mind that he said the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. But I can assure the gentleman that the whole question of credit and controls will continue to have the attention of our committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Until the Congress of the United States takes back the power vested in it by the Constitution to coin money and regulate the value thereof, you are going to have this wild and unlimited inflation that we are suffering from now, and you are not going to cure anything by attempting to fix prices and control the supply.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. The guaranty provisions as to quantity which have been written in the conference report provide 35 pounds and possibly up to 50 pounds for the housewives.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We guarantee 35 pounds for the housewife and then provide that any increase over the estimates will be allocated to her until she has received up to 50 pounds.

Mr. DINGELL. Essentially that is my understanding of it. Even if that were not in the bill, the governmental authority having to do with the rationing and distribution of sugar would certainly not sanction hoarding sugar in storage, would they?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The House committee felt that the amount of available sugar should be made available as quickly as possible to the housewife. I think the hearings indicate she would get at least 35 pounds. As a matter of fact, I think we assured the House when the matter was under consideration that she would get 10 pounds more than last year. So the 35 pounds written in the Senate language made no additional guarantee. She would have gotten 35 pounds regardless of that action.

Mr. DINGELL. But if the volume of sugar produced was less than would permit distribution per capita in the amount of 35 pounds, the guarantee in itself would mean nothing, would it?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. We assure her that she is going to get 35 pounds.

Mr. DINGELL. On the visible supply? It might be more on the estimated world supply of sugar.

Mr. WOLCOTT. To be practical and realistic about it, we are confident there will be enough sugar so without any guaranty in the law she would have gotten 35 pounds anyway, and we hope she can get up to 50 pounds.

Mr. DINGELL. That is what I am trying to bring out, but that will depend on the present maturing crop—that is, the total volume, not alone in the United States and off-shore sugar-producing areas, but the world supply of sugar. That will be the deciding factor as to how much sugar the housewives will get and what the commercial user of sugar will get.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. The available supply is getting better and better. The prospect of increases seems to be getting better.

Mr. DINGELL. Is the gentleman fully satisfied with the provisions having to do with the controls of sugar inventories?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Personally, I am reasonably well satisfied with the provisions in respect to inventory controls.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have received a great many letters from people saying there is a large amount of sugar in storage throughout the country—in the stores. I want to point out to the gentleman that before the end of this week more than a billion pounds of that sugar will pass from the warehouses and stores into the hands of consumers, with this new 10-pound ration stamp which will go on April 1.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman has answered the question which was asked a while ago much better than I did, and has clarified the situation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If the Congress were to refuse to adopt this conference report or pass this bill, as I understand it, the controls on sugar would go off now; is that correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Tonight at 12 o'clock.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I am for that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman refer to page 6 of the conference report, the language with reference to the reduction from 50,000 to 25,000 tons? Is that 25,000 tons there referred to the same as the tonnage referred to in section 3 of subparagraph (b) on page 2?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Where it is broken down into 12,500-ton lots?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. May I say to the gentleman the Senate had provided 50,000 tons for the full year, up to March 31st. The conferees cut it in half. It had been allocated on a quarterly basis, but extending it to October 31st the gentleman will see runs it over into the fourth quarter. So we had to divide it

there somewhere, and we divided it on June 30, 1947.

Mr. CRAWFORD. One additional question on that same 25,000 tons: Is it out of that reserve, 12,500 tons quarterly, that the Secretary is to have the possibility of meeting, for instance, a very heavy fruit production, say in California or western Michigan or some other heavy fruit-producing State? In other words, can he take from that 25,000 tons the necessary sugar to increase the commercial or industrial allotment in an area where there is a great fruit crop?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think I have answered the question. It is my understanding that the sugar which should be made available for the classifications which the gentleman calls attention to is in addition to the minimum of 25,000 tons.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Where would that language appear? That is what I should like to clear up.

Mr. WOLCOTT. To be frank with the gentleman, I do not know that it is so specific. That is my understanding, and I think the understanding of the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VISIT OF THE PRESIDENT OF MEXICO MAY 1, 1947

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I want to announce that the President of Mexico, His Excellency Miguel Aleman, will address a joint meeting of the Members of the Senate and House on Thursday, May 1, 1947, at 12:30 p. m.

I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time on Thursday, May 1, such recess to be subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by him on Government control of sources of information, which appears in the current issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include therein two letters.

GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, Constantine Brown, able and popular foreign analyst of the Washington Star, and his charming wife have been in Europe since last January. Mrs. Brown, the former Helen Lombard, is one of the best known women in Washington, herself a scribe of wide experience, brilliant author of a book entitled "Washington Waltz," a volume dealing with the diplomatic life of Washington, and of a recent book entitled "While They Fought," which depicts events behind the scenes in our Nation's Capital during 1941 to 1946. They are now visiting Turkey.

In yesterday's Star, Mr. Brown points out that the guerrilla bands which have been and are now harassing the feeble Government of Greece were organized in other Balkan countries. They are large and powerful. They are well equipped and well supplied with stores of all kinds, derived mainly from two sources, UNRRA and lend-lease from the United States. How did they get them?

Now we are asked to send more supplies to those countries to stop the march of communism. What assurance have we that such supplies will not also fall into the hands of these communistic guerrilla bands and be used against us to defeat the very purpose for which they are sent?

It is tragic indeed that while we appease and coddle Communists in the United States we are urged to send supplies to halt their progress in other parts of the world.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY: PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF HOUSE

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon notwithstanding that the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

BOY SCOUT JAMBOREE IN FRANCE

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. R. 1621 to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boys Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to lend, at his discretion, to the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, for use at the World Jamboree, Boy Scouts, to be held in France, in the months of July and August 1947, the following: 225 canvas bags, 1,200 duffel bags, 2,900 wool blankets, 200 vinegar bottles, 200 sugar bowls, 1,200 canvas watering buckets,

205 tent oil-stove burners, 25 corrugated nesting galvanized cans (24 gallon), 210 corrugated nesting galvanized cans (32 gallon), 1,200 meat cans, 200 five-gallon water cans, 1,200 aluminum canteens, 225 flag cases, 1,300 folding chairs, 200 alarm clocks, 100 round insulated containers, 1,250 folding canvas cots, 1,200 canteen covers, 1,200 aluminum canteen cups, 10 empty field desks, 25 five-gallon gasoline drums, ten 55-gallon gasoline drums, 225 national standard flags, 225 wooden flagstaves, 1,500 forks, 100 halazone tablets (bottles), 25 immersion type for can heaters, 1,500 knives, 225 gasoline lanterns, 1 stencil-duplicating machine, 2,850 pillowcases, 1,250 feather pillows, 500 sirup pitchers, 300 water pitchers, 200 mustard pots, 200 stock pots, 7 field ranges, 25 latrine screens, 10 field safes, 200 pepper shakers, 200 salt shakers, 160 cotton bed sheets, 1,500 spoons, 205 tent stoves, 10 folding camp tables, 120 mess tables, 3 assembly tents, and 200 squad tents: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused the United States Government by the delivery and return of said property, the same to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of the said jamboree as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of War and the National Council, Boy Scouts of America: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War before delivering said property shall take from the said Boy Scouts of America a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of said property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of War is further authorized, at his discretion and without expense to the United States, to provide transportation from the United States and return, on a vessel of the Army Transport Service, to those Boy Scouts of America and Scouters certified by the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America, attending this jamboree. That the amounts paid to the United States to reimburse it for expenses incurred under sections 1 and 2 of this act shall be deposited to the credit of such of the current appropriations for the support of the Army as bear such expenses, and shall be available for the same purposes as those appropriations.

Sec. 3. The taxes imposed by sections 3469 and 3475, or any comparable sections that may now or during 1947 be in effect, of the Internal Revenue Code, shall not apply to amounts paid for ocean transportation to the persons and property herein and above described attending this jamboree.

Sec. 4. That under such regulations as he may prescribe the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters of the Boy Scouts of America who are citizens of the United States or, if not citizens of the United States, who owe permanent allegiance to the United States upon certification by the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, as to their qualifications to attend this jamboree as representing the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, without fee for the application of the issuance of said passports.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 9, after the word "tents", insert "and such other equipment as may be required by the Boy Scouts of America which is available from American stocks."

Page 4, line 23, strike out the word "of" and insert "for or."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] introduced a similar bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Clarksburg Telegram entitled "Congress Keeps a Promise."

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include certain statistics, tables, and a report.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include correspondence between himself and Mr. Clayton, also an article from the New York Times and an address made over the radio.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four instances, in each to include an article.

Mr. McDOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

FIRST REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I would like to announce that today the committee issues its first report, a 56-page highly documented report entitled "The Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power."

Mr. Speaker, the facts contained in this pamphlet are the result of intensive study of several experts which, in one case, has extended over a period of 30 years of Communist activities and observations both in and out of the Communist Party.

The entire tenor of the contents of this report can be gained in the first four sentences, which I would like to read:

The Communist movement of the United States may be properly characterized as—

1. An organization operating under centralized discipline subordinated to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the single and ruling party of that country.

2. A section of a World Communist Party, controlled by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

3. An organization whose basic aim, whether open or concealed is the abolition of our present economic system and democratic form of government and the establishment of a Soviet dictatorship in its place.

4. An organization resorting to deception, evasion, illegal methods, violence, and civil war, methods implicit in its revolutionary purpose.

All Members will receive a copy of this report, and I highly recommend that every Member of Congress read it.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, like an old family skeleton in the closet, our huge Government debt is rattling its billions of bones. We prefer to ignore it in favor of more thrilling discussions of tax and budget reductions.

But most important to our economy is a careful and exacting study of the management of this debt.

In addition to my speech of last Wednesday, therefore, I shall, from time to time, report to the House the results of some inquiries I am conducting. I hope, in this manner, to create an interest in this subject.

From President Truman on down, the administration advises us that the important thing about our \$260,000,000,000 debt is the annual interest charge. The debt itself can be paid whenever we get around to it; meanwhile, we can well afford to pay an interest charge of "only" \$5,000,000,000.

But why five billion? Why, indeed?

When the war ended on September 2, 1945, this Nation owed virtually the same amount of debt it owes today. But it paid only \$4,500,000,000 a year for interest on this debt. And it would pay only \$4,500,000,000 today for annual interest charges if the administration had not, through the wholly unnecessary Victory loan and subsequent pay-offs, managed to substitute twenty billions in long-term high-interest securities for short-term seven-eighths percent and 1½ percent securities on hand when the war ended. Nor is this the end.

In a study of Full Employment Patterns, 1950, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor assumes—see page 12—that—

No reduction in the size of the debt will be attempted during 1950.

Granting this assumption, it goes on to estimate—see page 13—that the interest charge on the debt will not be \$4,500,000,000 nor even \$5,000,000,000, but \$5,600,000,000.

It would appear that the administration, far from anticipating an actual net reduction of the debt, is bending every effort to see how high an interest charge we can afford to pay. Within 5 years after World War II it will have increased this annual charge by more than \$1,000,000,000—and this wholly unwarranted increase will equal the entire prewar cost of the debt, \$1,100,000,000 of interest.

CATTLE IN NEBRASKA

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I point with some pride to the recent figures released by the Department of

Commerce from the 1945 census which revealed that Cherry County, Nebr., in the Fourth Congressional District led all the 3,069 counties in the United States in cattle on farms. Six other counties in the Fourth District were among the first 100 counties. It will be interesting to my friends from the eastern part of our great country to know that Cherry County has an area of 5,982 square miles or 25 square miles larger than the States of Connecticut and Rhode Island together. Six counties in the Fourth Nebraska District are larger in area than the State of Connecticut.

The seven leading counties in the Fourth Nebraska District with their national rating, and their January 1, 1945 cattle and calves inventories follow:

County	Ranking	Cattle
Cherry.....	1	237,888
Custer.....	12	141,159
Holt.....	13	140,199
Lincoln.....	17	124,394
Sheridan.....	31	99,625
Garden.....	36	95,753
Dawson.....	82	76,460

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address I delivered before the Agricultural Limestone Division of Pennsylvania last Monday at Harrisburg. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that this will exceed the authorized limit, but notwithstanding that fact I ask that it be printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HARRY L. HAINES

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to report the death of a former Member of this House, my predecessor, who served here with you for 10 years, the Honorable Harry L. Haines, of Red Lion. At that time it was the Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania. While I differed very seriously with Mr. Haines on a great many important national issues, my respect for him as a citizen was not affected by it. Mr. Haines was elected and served here for 10 years, and always carried the esteem of his friends who knew him best and lived closest to him. Whatever they said or did not say of Mr. Haines, there was one thing you had to say about him: He was always a gentleman. He enjoyed a strong, Christian faith. He was a leader in his church and Sunday school. His town was known as the best attended Sunday school town of any city of the United States. He was one of the men who was responsible for that.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I served with Harry Haines for 10 years. I was closely associated with him. I regarded him as one man who measured up to Thomas Jefferson's standard who, when asked what were the essential questions to be asked of an applicant for office, replied, "Is he honest? Is he qualified? Is he faithful?" I never met a finer, more conscientious public servant in this House or elsewhere than Harry Haines, of Pennsylvania.

He was a statesman without duplicity, a Christian without hypocrisy, and a man without guile.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I would like to pay this tribute to Harry Haines as a colleague whom I served with in the House of Representatives. He was one of the finest men I ever knew. Mr. Haines came from Pennsylvania. He was honorable and conscientious. I do not think that I had a better friend in the Congress at any time, nor did I ever consider any Member of Congress a better friend of mine than was Harry Haines. I always admired him because he was straightforward and honest, and it was a great pleasure to serve with him. I am sure the people of his own county and State have lost a great citizen—one who shall always be remembered as a real gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

His town of Red Lion was known as the cigar center of the United States for many years. They made 7 percent of the cigars of the country there at one time. He was one of the pioneers of that industry. During the First World War he was chairman of the American Red Cross in his county. He was chairman of the Lion's Club and governor of the State organization. He was a director of the Keystone Automobile Club of the county, as well as the Boy Scouts of America. He was also on the committee of York County Manufacturers' Association and the National League of Masonic Clubs.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I doubt if I can add anything to the splendid tributes that have been paid to the memory of Harry Haines. I knew him all the years he was a Member of the House of Representatives. I remember him, and I always shall, as an earnest, honest, able servant of the people, and to those he leaves behind I would like to say that they have my deepest and heartfelt sympathies.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Harry Haines was born and reared in the community in which he died. He was one of the leaders in everything that was for the benefit of that community during those years. The community mourns the loss of an outstanding citizen. I am happy to say that he leaves five sons and daughters who will carry on and who are a credit to the community.

He furthermore leaves, I believe, eight grandchildren and one great-grandchild. I much regret to see the passing of this good citizen and extend to his bereaved family my deep sympathy.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the death of Harry Haines must have saddened the hearts of everyone whose privilege it was to come in contact with him during a full life. It was my privilege to serve with Mr. Haines for 8 years in this body. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that there was never a more sincere and hard-working public servant in this body during this period than Harry Haines.

Mr. Haines was a deeply religious man. I remember back during the dark days of the early thirties how disturbed he was at the move of our great Republic toward things that perhaps were foreign to his fundamental beliefs. Mr. Haines found comfort in the realization that all the steps taken during that period were taken from an emergency standpoint and for the purpose of trying to get us back on an even keel.

Mr. Haines has made a great contribution to the welfare of the entire Nation. I know his community and his fine family must indeed be very sad today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radiogram to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject House Tax Bill Lightens "Little's Fellow's" Burden, and include certain tables.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in reference to the Moscow Conference.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HERTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, our Assistant Secretary of State, Will Clayton, with about 100 experts, counselors, and advisers, leaves next week for Geneva to sit down at an international economic poker game that will last for some 3 months. Judging by the performances of our State Department in the past at international poker games, Uncle Sam will come home from this poker game

without his economic shirt. I am going to speak on this matter next Monday, and at that time I expect to ask questions of this House and of the Nation that I was prevented from asking Will Clayton on Saturday by a point of order being made in the Committee on Ways and Means.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity of bringing to the attention of the House and, particularly, those Members who have expressed interest in the matter, that I am today, as chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and at the direction of the committee, introducing a resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make an inquiry and complete study of the policies and procedures of the Federal Communications Commission.

The original act was approved June 19, 1934. It is the opinion of many that it is appropriate, after this lapse of nearly 13 years, to reexamine the whole subject and ascertain whether and to what extent the original intent of Congress is being administered. There has come to the committee considerable complaint as to some of the policies now in effect and the procedures for administering the act.

The inquiry is not intended as a witch hunt, or for any purpose other than to make certain that present laws and administration are making available to the people of the United States the full use of radio communication upon the terms and conditions that best serve the public. Already a start has been made in this important matter by conferences between the committee and the Commission. The purpose of the resolution I am introducing is to widen the scope and make more effective the course which the committee has inaugurated and desires to pursue.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. I understand it will be in excess of the amount allowed, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

RESULTS OF POLL ON NATIONAL ISSUES

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting copy of the questionnaire which in March 1947 I attempted to place

in the hands of as many citizens of my district as possible. It was humanly impossible to send such a questionnaire to each citizen of my district, but I believe the replies received fully cover the opinions of the majority of the people of the Seventeenth Ohio District, which it is my honor to represent.

My district might well be considered the Main Street of our Nation. We have approximately 50 percent urban and 50 percent rural populations; all labor and farm organizations represented; as well as large industries and small business; two colleges and two universities.

The questionnaire was sent to each committeeman and committeewoman, both Democratic and Republican, labor groups, farm groups, attorneys, barbers, business and industry, housewives, newspapers, professional groups—doctors and dentists, and so forth—public office holders, salesmen, and school teachers. A total of 2,500 questionnaires was sent and the number of returns received—1,260—proves to me that the people are anxious to express their views on issues before the Congress for consideration.

I hope that each Member of Congress will carefully study the opinions as expressed by the people of the Seventeenth District of Ohio.

WHY IS THE NAVY WITHHOLDING INFORMATION FROM CONGRESS?

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as a member of the Public Lands Committee and at the request of the chairman of that committee, I recently inspected two of the non-self-governing possessions of the United States in the company of the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Krug, and two of my colleagues the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the gentleman from Hawaii, Delegate FARRINGTON.

On that trip, I learned many things about the hundreds of square miles of public lands of the United States in the far Pacific, about their local inhabitants, and about their government.

The Secretary of the Navy pursuant to Executive orders of the President is charged with the responsibility of administering the civil affairs of the people of Guam and Samoa. In his capacity as governor of an island population of American nationals it is his responsibility to keep the President and Congress informed of the wishes of the people he governs and to protect to the fullest the civil liberties and basic freedoms of these non-self-governing peoples. Among the rights of all Americans is the right to petition the Congress of the United States.

In Guam, which is ruled by a United States naval governor under the supervision of, and directly responsible to, the Secretary of the Navy, James F. Forrestal, I was told by certain of the people of the island—not by the naval governor—that they had petitioned the

Congress of the United States for full citizenship and the enactment of an organic act for the government of their island.

Gentlemen, I have in my possession a copy of that petition, Joint Resolution 1, of the Eighth Guam Congress, which was unanimously adopted by that body of elected representatives of the people of Guam on January 4, 1947, and forwarded to the United States naval governor of Guam for forwarding, through channels of naval authority, to the Eightieth Congress of the United States. That petition has not to my knowledge been presented to this Congress to this date. Knowledge of that petition has been deliberately withheld from the Congress by the Navy Department—James F. Forrestal, presiding.

In American Samoa, the United States naval governor, who is also under the supervision of and directly responsible to Mr. Forrestal, told our party that the local inhabitants of American Samoa had not requested a change in their form of government. Gentlemen, at this moment, I have in my possession a true copy of an enactment of the 1945 General Fono of all the leading chiefs of American Samoa in which they proposed to the Congress of the United States a form of organic act for government of American Samoa.

Gentlemen, that request—that petition—from the duly elected chiefs of 16,000 loyal Americans has not to my knowledge been presented to this Congress to this date. Nor has the Congress been informed by Mr. Forrestal of the wishes of the people for local self-government. Knowledge of that request has also been deliberately withheld from the Congress of the United States by the Navy Department, James F. Forrestal, presiding.

Why have not these petitions been transmitted to Congress? They have been presented to the naval governors who are directly responsible to Mr. Forrestal and yet have never been transmitted to the Congress.

Mr. Forrestal, pursuant to Executive orders of the President, is responsible for the 40,000 civilians, including many resident Americans on Guam and Samoa.

The civil liberties and basic freedoms of these Americans should be as important to the administration as is the democracy of the Greeks and the Turks. I concur in the belief that the Reds must be eliminated from our Government but while the present administration is hunting Reds in its efforts to preserve democracy, it is stifling democracy in our own non-self-governing Territories by deliberately denying these people access to the Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio (at the request of Mr. JONES of Ohio) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Deputy Administrator C. H. Nance, of the Veterans' Administration, Bedford Hospital, Addition for Women Patients at Bedford, Mass., and a state-

ment by Dr. Burrier, administrator of the hospital.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make on the First Deficiency Appropriations bill in committee and to include certain statutory provisions and tables and excerpts from committee hearings.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each a memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon.

THE HAND OF ESAU AND THE VOICE OF JOHNSTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Mr. Eric Johnston, a representative of the motion-picture industry, came before the Committee on Un-American Activities and read a lengthy statement, which has been referred to as "The Hand of Esau and the Voice of Johnston."

If Mr. Johnston does not know of the Communist infiltration into Hollywood, he should study the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities as well as the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

We have definite information that for years the script writers and movie actors in Hollywood contributed as much as \$3,000 a week to the Communist Party—a subversive organization which is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government.

Large numbers of moving pictures that come out of Hollywood carry the Communist line.

We are called upon to challenge the spread of communism throughout the world because of its threat to the civilization of mankind. Yet we have them in Hollywood spreading their poisonous propaganda through the moving pictures. We have them on the radio sending their poisonous propaganda into every home. We have them in our educational institutions putting in extra time poisoning the minds of the youth of the land who are being educated at public expense.

If we are going to challenge the spread of communism throughout the world, let us begin at home and put a stop to the use of our public institutions and our public methods of communication by this dangerous element—these enemies within our gates.

As I told Mr. Johnston, unless the people in control of the moving-picture industry are willing to clean house and fumigate, then Congress will have to do it for them.

We are not going to permit American civilization to be destroyed in this way.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances; in one to include an editorial from today's Washing-

ton Times-Herald on the housing situation; in the second instance to include an editorial from the New York Times of today on Edgar L. Warren and the Conciliation Service, as well as a newspaper article from the Washington Evening Star; in the third instance to include a newspaper article by Sidney Fields, from the Daily Mirror, and an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of March 26; and in the fourth instance to include a newspaper article in today's Washington Daily News by Thomas L. Stokes.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement issued jointly by the governors of six New England States in support of the Truman policy.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record on the Centralia Illinois mine disaster and include three editorials.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and in each case to include a newspaper article.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a letter from the Rochester Diocesan Holy Name Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Lowell Sun.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, April 10, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 15 minutes in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Joseph Pulitzer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate shall continue for 3 hours, the time to be controlled by and equally divided between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does that mean the

entire day will be devoted to general debate on this bill?

Mr. TABER. I would hardly expect the entire day would be devoted to that, because, as I understand, there is a conference report expected from the Senate on the War Powers Act, and I understand it will be the purpose of the leadership to have that disposed of. Perhaps we may even rise during the progress of the debate in order to do that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a statement about the conference report. It is absolutely necessary that this conference report be agreed to before midnight. Therefore, the Chair would like the Committee to rise when that conference report comes from the Senate so that it may be acted upon immediately instead of waiting until late in the evening.

Mr. CANNON. Then it is possible that general debate may extend into tomorrow?

Mr. TABER. It might a little, but I think that I should say for the benefit of the membership that it will not be my purpose to try to read the bill tonight.

Mr. CANNON. The bill, then, positively will not be read today?

Mr. TABER. That will be my understanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 2849, first deficiency appropriation bill, 1947, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, we have here a deficiency bill involving \$2,471,000,000. The estimates have been reduced below the budget by \$628,000,000. I am going to spend a little time at this point in describing what items are in this bill and discussing in a general way without too much detail what is included in the bill. I shall not cover the minor items, simply the major ones. The report goes into the full question in detail.

A good many of the items covered by this bill are for pay increases that have been allowed, and other items are for things that have come up as a result of contingencies that could not be foreseen. Some of them are for such things as new activities that have been created.

There is here a grant to States of \$135,000,000 for old-age assistance; \$9,064,000 for grants to states to administer the Unemployment Insurance Compensation Act; \$2,780,000 for the Public Buildings Administration.

The bill contains provision to meet some damage claims.

There is included \$1,881,000 for the new obligations of the Railroad Retirement Act resulting from the situation

that was presented by the Crosser bill last summer.

There is \$1,451,000,000 to take care of the Veterans' Administration.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TABER. Yes; but I am not going into any detail on this item until I get a little further along. I am simply going down through the items hurriedly to give an over-all picture.

There are a number of items for the District of Columbia totaling \$4,035,000. The chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, by the way, persuaded us to add \$665 on one item above the budget.

There is a small item for the government of St. Croix and the Virgin Islands. There is over-all \$20,000,000 for the Post Office Department, \$20,000,000, which was covered by a budget estimate for crop insurance, \$465,000,000 for pay of the Army, and \$300,000,000 for relief in occupied areas which goes to the Army. There is also an item of about \$278,000,000 for pay of the Navy. That is represented by transfers.

The Veterans' Administration item represents a cut of \$200,000,000 on account of Army pensions. Taking the figures that General Bradley presented to us and upon his own testimony and concessions, we were able to cut that figure \$200,000,000. The estimate had been made up some time before, and I do not believe they had taken into consideration certain facts which had arisen in the trend of those items. There is a very liberal figure in there, and that is conceded.

There is a cut of a million dollars for printing and binding, but that is small and is based entirely on what seemed to be their needs. There is no cut in the hospital service or the administrative service, although General Bradley has recognized that the number of employees has gone up too fast and he has told us he intends to reduce the number of civilian employees outside of the hospital picture by about 5,000 by the end of the present fiscal year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What accounts for most of the reduction in that appropriation?

Mr. TABER. They are all based on ordinary mathematics, taking the public expenditures for the months to come and multiplying them by the number of months yet to go in the appropriation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I was not concerned so much with the method employed in making the reduction but as to what services the reductions were taken from?

Mr. TABER. Well, the estimates that we found with more money than they actually need.

The first one was the item for pensions, and we found that they are agreeing to General Bradley's own statement, allowing a very considerable margin to go by. They had \$200,000,000 more in the estimate than they could possibly use in the balance of the fiscal year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Does this figure represent the figure submitted by General Bradley, or did he concur in this reduction?

Mr. TABER. After he had been examined for awhile and we analyzed the figures, he admitted that we could make this cut.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. And can this cut be made and keep up the vital services of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. TABER. This cut relates only to one item in the service. The item for administration of hospitals and the item for the Veterans' Administration itself was not cut, although frankly I felt that on the basis of the expenditures that had been made and that were in sight, there probably was \$25,000,000 margin in the picture.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Do I understand correctly that the total reduction in the appropriations under the deficiency bill is \$628,139,491?

Mr. TABER. I think that is correct.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Out of that amount the total reduction in the Veterans' Administration is \$551,020,000?

Mr. TABER. That is right, but the reduction in the Veterans' Administration was based on what the needs of the Administration would be without attempting in any way to curtail the emoluments or the pensions or the educational facilities or the unemployment insurance that the veterans are entitled to.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. In other words, they are on estimates committed on pensions and readjustment benefits. Possibly later on they will have to be made up anyway, will they not?

Mr. TABER. If there is a shortage they will have to be made up, but I would not think there would be a shortage, because we have been very liberal in our figures.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. But we are committed under the law to meet these benefits.

Mr. TABER. Oh, that would be an obligation of the Government and we would have to pay them, but it would not behoove us to appropriate more funds than the progress of operations under the Veterans' Administration indicated would be required. It is all right to allow a reasonable margin, but it would not be proper for us to provide a large amount in addition to what the requirements would probably be, and that is the type of consideration that this appropriation bill has had.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Did I understand the gentleman to say that we have a \$25,000,000 margin?

Mr. TABER. In my own opinion they have a \$25,000,000 margin over what we can figure their possible requirements. In the first item, that is, the item for salaries and expenses and the pension item, I figure they have just about a \$20,000,000 margin which I would regard as sufficient, because that is quite a stabilized

item which can be figured much more closely than this rehabilitation picture that follows a little later on. I have forgotten whether it is the next item or not.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is as to those pensions that have already been established, is it not?

Mr. TABER. No; it is for the pensions that have already been established and which may be established and allowed in the period between now and the 30th of June. You see, we are not attempting in this bill to go beyond the 30th of June in our operations, because the regular bill for the Veterans' Administration will come in, maybe the 1st of May or about that time and will be taken up at that time, to provide funds for the next fiscal year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. I started to say something about the crop-insurance item of \$20,000,000. The budget estimate came up for that, and it has been included. The reason it was included is this: Claims have been allowed which they had no funds to meet of over \$20,000,000. There is no question but that there is an obligation on the part of the Government to meet that \$20,000,000 of claims. It was generally felt that as long as we had to take it and the Government owed the money we might just as well do it now. In my opinion, the whole operation has been very unfortunate. It shows a terrific loss from the beginning. I do not believe that if it were loaded with premiums sufficient to make it balance, anybody would take the insurance. I think it has been one of those things which the Government could get rid of.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I am glad the gentleman brought up the question of crop insurance. I have tried to make a study of it since 2 years ago, when we were asked for \$40,000,000 additional capital. This will make \$90,000,000 of capital all told paid in for this crop insurance, besides the \$37,000,000 of expense money they have had, besides making \$8,000,000 on wheat, and besides all the premiums that were paid in. They have lost practically everything. That does not finish up the job of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. I think it is one of the worst-managed pieces of business the Government ever got into. It never will be anything but a continuous loss if we keep it up.

Mr. TABER. I am very much inclined to believe the gentleman is correct.

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. PEDEN. Is it the gentleman's statement that he is against crop insurance as a policy?

Mr. TABER. I am. I do not think it can be done successfully, and I think that has been pretty well demonstrated.

Mr. PEDEN. If we could say that crop insurance has been poorly managed, which perhaps in some instances has made it operate at a loss, would the gentleman still say that if management

could be had that would provide it in an equitable and just manner, as a principle, crop insurance is a good thing?

Mr. TABER. I doubt if it is a practical thing. My own judgment after quite careful study is that it is not a practical proposition nor one that can ever work out.

We have had certain items up with reference to the Army and Navy pay. Those items have been computed by members of the committee, some on one side of the aisle and some on the other, and are reductions that have been made. These items have been based on what the thing figured out to on the basis of the number of men they have had and the number they expect to have the rest of this fiscal year.

We are carrying here an item of \$300,000,000 for relief in occupied areas for the Army. This means in Germany, Japan, Korea, and Austria. There we have this situation. There is a saving in sight in the Korean and Japanese end of the picture of approximately \$56,000,000, and if we are going to get Germany in a position where she can very largely take care of her own food problem, another \$28,000,000. For that reason, we felt it was wise to carry the whole \$300,000,000 estimate so that there might be enough in the pipe lines to take care of our picture down through the first of October and through the crop year. Later on, as the regular committee gets to meet that problem, they will be able to take these figures into consideration. There are many distressing problems over there. Some of them are natural and some artificial. For instance, under the restrictions of the Potsdam Agreement it is impossible for the Germans to catch more than 100,000 tons of fish whereas their prewar catch was 700,000 tons. We are making up the deficiency. I do not know whether that is the right thing to do or not, but it does not seem so to me.

Those restrictions should be loosened up so that Germany can catch the fish that she needs and not be dependent entirely on charity.

There were many distressing things that came to our attention during the hearings upon that particular subject.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If the powers that be in these foreign countries that we are looking after and for which we are supposed to be the guardian angels would permit them to do their own work so that they could earn some of their own living and would not have to expect the United States to buy the things that are necessary for them to sustain life, how much lighter would be the burden on our taxpayers. I think the gentleman from New York is absolutely right. Those in authority should permit them to earn their own living rather than expect us to support them and keep them.

Mr. TABER. At the present time, according to the testimony we had, UNRRA was getting ready to send \$50,000,000 of stuff to Yugoslavia, \$50,000,000 to Poland, \$22,000,000 to the Ukraine, \$11,000,000 to White Russia, and \$20,000,000 to Russian occupied zones in Austria. I suppose the UNRRA is an international organization,

but most of the food and most of the money comes from us. Export licenses are required for every single item that is put out.

Frankly, it has seemed to me that before we grant export licenses for that sort of thing we should say to Mr. Stalin and say it plainly that we expect free elections to be held in Poland and that we expect free elections to be held in Yugoslavia; we expect Russia to abide by the agreements that she made to avoid propaganda here in the United States; that we expect her to quit inciting border hostilities along the northern part of Greece before we contribute any more of our food or our supplies to the Russian-controlled territories. I do not make this as a criticism of the State Department but as a suggestion of a way that would seem to me to lead toward the peace of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman rather answer the questions that I have regarding the so-called cuts in the Veterans' Administration or have the gentleman from Massachusetts answer them?

Mr. TABER. It does not make any difference. The gentleman from Massachusetts will be here in a few minutes and I know he will be glad to answer them.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman prefer that he answer them?

Mr. TABER. It does not make any difference.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand there was a reduction of \$1,000,000 for printing and binding. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That probably could be justified, could it?

Mr. TABER. Oh, I think so, according to the past expenditure, so far.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This is only a deficiency bill, anyway.

Mr. TABER. That is all, to carry them through to the end of the year.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Apparently there was a cut of \$200,000,000 in pensions. Of course, even if you cut pensions today, those payments are authorized by law and you would have to put it in the 1948 appropriation bill if you took it out of the deficiency bill. Am I correct in that?

Mr. TABER. Oh, we would have to pay it if there was a deficiency, but there will be no deficiency, and General Bradley himself admitted that in the hearings.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. On the readjustment benefits, I understand there is a cut of \$350,000,000. That is also true of that item, is it not? That is authorized by law and the Congress, of course, would have to pay those benefits.

Mr. TABER. The Congress would have to pay them, but on the other hand

we figured to allow them a \$170,000,000 margin in that connection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. On the Federal Court claims, my understanding is a \$20,000 cut is provided for in some other way. Is that true?

Mr. TABER. All those tort claims in all departments, we have decided should be treated alike and that they should be paid out of existing funds, rather than to set up a fund in advance for the departments to handle. They have not got to the point where they have any. They do not know what it will be or anything about it. That is an item that is a matter of management all the way through the whole Government, rather than the policy as to the Veterans' Administration.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So that is really not a cut?

Mr. TABER. It is wiped out because we felt that handing them a bloc of money for something they did not know anything about and had no past experience with, was not good business, and we felt that way with every department.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I come to another matter that does trouble me very much. Apparently you call for the release of a hundred people in the Public Relations Division.

Mr. TABER. Yes. That is probably one of the things that is making more trouble for the Veterans' Administration than anything else. They have built up their force from 8 to 284. We felt that that Propaganda Division should be reduced; that that was one case where a very major mistake had been made.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is my understanding that if the money is not available for these people they will be dismissed without any way of getting their terminal leave or other money that is due them?

Mr. TABER. I do not understand that at all, and I do not think anyone else believes that would result.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did the gentleman have hearings on the work of the Public Relations Division of the Bureau?

Mr. TABER. Yes; we did.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Does the gentleman think there might be any danger in the reduction of these estimates for benefits and pensions of veterans that might influence the Veterans' Administration to be tighter in their rulings or freeze up in their consideration of the continuation of benefits?

Mr. TABER. Not in the slightest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are two or three other items I would like to cover very briefly. If you will turn in the report to "Judgments and authorized claims," there are three that involves \$2,158.01 for three people named Watson, Lovett, and Dodd. These people were on the pay roll of the United States Government,

two of them in the Federal Communications Commission and one of them in the Virgin Islands. It appeared from testimony that was presented to committees at the time, after very careful hearings, that these people did not owe their first loyalty to the United States. The Congress, by an overwhelming vote, refused to provide any funds for the payment of their salaries.

To my mind, these judgments have such an odor that I could not possibly conscientiously bring in here a bill to appropriate funds to pay them. They have been left out.

I think that is all I have to say at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2849), first deficiency appropriation bill, 1947, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a statement of a former colleague of ours from New York, Mr. Fish.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 931) entitled "An act to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act."

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. DONNELL and Mr. MAGNUSON as additional conferees on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 146) entitled "joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF TITLE III OF SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers.

The conference report and statement as as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act shall be cited as the 'First Decentralization Act of 1947'."

"Sec. 2. The Congress hereby declared that it is vital to a free economy and full production in the United States that all emergency controls and war powers under the Second War Powers Act be removed except in certain limited instances.

"The Congress further declares that in each such limited instance the authority for such emergency controls and war powers should not be exercised by the grant of broad, general war powers but should be granted by restrictive, specific legislation.

"Sec. 3. For the purpose of liquidating existing emergency controls and war powers and for the purpose of affording further opportunity for the appropriate committees of the Congress to consider specific legislation granting restricted authority in limited instances, title XV, section 1501, of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, approved March 27, 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 1501. Except as otherwise provided by statute enacted during the first session of the 80th Congress on or before the date this section as amended takes effect, titles I, II, III, IV, V, VII, and XIV of this Act and the amendments to existing law made by such titles shall remain in force only until March 31, 1947, except that such title III, and the amendments to existing law made by such title, shall remain in force until June 30, 1947, for the following purposes: (a) Allocations of cinchona bark and cinchona alkaloids, manila (abaca) fiber and cordage, agave fiber and cordage, tin and tin products, antimony and streptomycin; (b) allocations limited to control of production for export of tractors; (c) allocations of the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carriers; (d) allocations of materials or facilities for export which are required to expand the production in foreign countries of materials critically needed in the United States; (e) allocations of materials or facilities which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments: *Provided*, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III: *Provided further*, That the two Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate an earlier time for the termination of any power of allocation under such title: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to continue beyond March 31, 1947, any authority to allocate sugar, rubber, or the derivatives thereof. After the amendments made by any such title cease to be in force,

any provisions of law amended thereby (except subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1940, as amended by the Act of May 31, 1941) shall be in full force and effect as though this Act had not been enacted."

And the House agree to the same.

EARL C. MICHENER,
RAYMOND S. SPRINGER,
EDWARD J. DEVITT,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
FADJO CRAVENS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
FORREST C. DONNELL,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
J. HOWARD McGRATH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House amendment to the bill strikes out all the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommended that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

Except for the differences noted in the following statement, the conference substitute is the same as the House bill.

The first section of the bill as agreed to in conference is the same as the first section of the bill as it passed the Senate. It provides that the act shall be cited as the "First Decentralization Act of 1947."

Section 2 of the Senate bill contained a declaration of policy and in section 3 of the Senate bill was a statement that the provisions of the bill were for the purpose of liquidating existing emergency controls and war powers and of affording opportunity for the appropriate committees of Congress to consider specific legislation with respect to limited instances. Section 2 of the bill as agreed to in conference contains the same declaration of policy as section 2 of the Senate bill, and the statement in section 3 of the Senate bill, as to the purpose of the legislation, is contained in section 3 of the bill as agreed to in conference as a statement of the purpose for which the amendment to section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act is made.

Section 3 of the bill as agreed to in conference proposes to amend title XV, section 1501, of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, in the same manner as proposed by the House amendment, except as follows:

(1) The following new language is added at the beginning of section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942: "Except as otherwise provided by statute enacted during the first session of the Eightieth Congress on or before the date of this section as amended takes effect."

This language was added in order not to repeal House Joint Resolution 118 (80th Cong., 1st sess., entitled "Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry") or House Joint Resolution 146 (80th Cong., 1st sess., entitled "Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes"), in the event that either or both of such joint resolutions become law before the enactment into law of the conference substitute.

(2) The language contained in the House amendment with respect to building materials and facilities is deleted. Allocation and priority authority with respect to materials and facilities suitable for the construction and/or completion of housing accommodations in rural and urban areas, and for the construction and repair of essential farm buildings, is contained in section 4 of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946. This act expires December 31, 1947.

(3) Under the House amendment title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment to existing law made by such title, would have remained in force for the purposes stated in the amendment until December 31, 1947. Under the conference substitute such title and amendment will remain in force until June 30, 1947, for the purposes stated in the conference substitute.

(4) Under the conference substitute, title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment made by such title, remain in force until June 30, 1947, for the purpose of allocations of manila (abaca) fiber and cordage and agave fiber and cordage.

(5) Under the House amendment title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment made by such title, would have remained in force for the following purpose:

"(b) allocations limited to control of production for export of automobiles and tractors."

The language in the conference substitute omits the words "automobiles and".

(6) The House amendment provided that title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and the amendment made by such title, shall remain in force for the following purpose:

"(c) allocating the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carriers."

The conference substitute uses the words "allocations of" instead of the word "allocating".

(7) The House amendment used the words "allocations of materials or equipment" in two instances. In order to use language more consistent with the language contained in the law amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, the conference substitute uses the words "allocations of materials or facilities".

(8) Under the House amendment title III of the Second War Powers Act, and the amendment made by such title, remain in force for the following purpose:

"(e) allocations of materials or equipment for export which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments."

The language in the conference substitute omits the words "for export" and changes the word "equipment" to the word "facilities".

(9) The conference substitute contains the following proviso that was not contained in the House amendment: "Provided, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III."

Such proviso is applicable to all materials and facilities referred to in clauses (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e).

(10) The House amendment to section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act contained the following: "Provided, That the two Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate an earlier time for the termination of any such title."

The conference substitute provides that the two Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate an earlier time for the termination of any power of allocation under such title.

(11) The conference substitute contains the following new proviso: "Provided further, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to continue beyond March 31, 1947, any authority to allocate sugar, rubber, or the derivatives thereof."

This proviso was added to make it clear that whatever authority there may be to allocate sugar, rubber, or the derivatives of either, is to be derived from House Joint Resolutions 146 and 118, if enacted into law, and not from the pending bill (S. 931). If House Joint Resolution 146 does not become law and no other statute is enacted there will be no authority under section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act, as amended by the conference substitute, to allocate sugar or its derivatives. If House Joint Resolution 118 does not become law and no other statute is enacted there will be no authority under the Second War Powers Act, as amended by the conference substitute, to allocate rubber or its derivatives.

(12) The last sentence of section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as proposed to be amended by the House amendment was as follows: "After the amendments made by any such title cease to be in force, any provisions of law amended thereby shall be in full force and effect as though this act had not been enacted."

In order to avoid having the allocation and priorities power revived as it existed before the enactment of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, the conference substitute excepts from this provision the law amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942.

EARL C. MICHENER,
RAYMOND S. SPRINGER,
EDWARD J. DEVITT,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
FADJO CRAVENS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate report on H. R. 931, which is Report No. 74, and the House report on H. R. 1983, which is House Report No. 192, plus the conference report just read, explains the whole situation. This is an unanimous agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield the 1 hour to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], chairman of the subcommittee which handled this matter in the House, for explanation, the hour to be yielded by the gentleman as he sees fit.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the conference report which is now before the House explains very fully the action taken by the conferees on this particular piece of legislation. The only variance between the House version and the version reported by the conferees is very meager. I will attempt to explain the variances at this time so the Members will become familiar with them.

The particular act which is before the committee was called, as you will remember, the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended. This has been changed and it is now denominated the First Decontrol Act of 1947. That came from the Senate bill and was agreed to by the conferees.

Section 2 of the conference report is added, and that comes from the original Senate bill, S. 931, which I think is entirely apropos at this particular time with respect to this particular piece of legislation.

Title XV, which relates to section 1501 of the act, is the one with which we are dealing, because it deals with the question of extension of time. Always remember that tonight at midnight the Second War Powers Act expires by reason of the limitation of time. It was found upon the hearings before the subcommittee in the House and it was also so determined by the conferees that there were certain

items which it was necessary that they be extended beyond this particular date. You will note in the conference report that titles I, II, III, IV, V, VII, and XIV of the Second War Powers Act are entirely eliminated, with the exception of certain items under title III which are extended. May I say that after the conferees had worked upon this report for quite a period of time it was finally unanimously agreed that the date for the final expiration of this particular act should be on June 30, 1947. You will recall that under the act in the form as it passed in the House certain items were extended until the 31st day of December 1947; but that date was eliminated, and each and every item which is contained in this bill, for extension, will expire on June 30, 1947.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I think the gentleman and the committee should be congratulated upon shortening that time. Is there any danger that it may be extended later as to any of these items?

Mr. SPRINGER. Not unless the House should vote to that effect. May I say that under section 2, which was written into the bill, this provision may be found:

The Congress further declares that in each such limited instance the authority for such emergency controls and war powers should not be exercised by the grant of broad, general war powers but should be granted by restrictive, specific legislation.

That is the attitude of the conferees with respect to that particular subject.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to have the gentleman explain subsection (e) which appears on page 4 under section (3) of the conference report.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I state to my good friend that I will reach that point in just a few moments, if the gentleman will wait.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I want to call the gentleman's attention to one of the exceptions found on page 2 which provides, among other things, items that are still to be under control, if I understand it correctly, such as allocations of the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carriers.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma that I will reach that point in just a few moments. I have one or two other matters I desire to explain before I reach that point.

Mr. RIZLEY. Very well. I would like to be heard on that point.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman. You will be given ample opportunity to be heard.

Under subsection (a) those things which are positively and definitely continued under this conference report re-

late to allocations of cinchona bark and cinchona alkaloids, manila fiber and cordage, agave fiber and cordage, tin and tin products, antimony, and streptomycin.

Under the evidence which was submitted to both the subcommittee in the House and the subcommittee in the Senate, it was shown without question of doubt that those particular items were critical and that there would be need and a necessity for an extension of the power for allocation of those items beyond this particular date, March 31. Therefore, those are extended with the others to which an extension was granted until June 30, 1947.

Under (b), allocations limited to control of production for export of tractors, there has been some question about tractors as far as the people in the United States are concerned. Therefore, for their protection allocations are continued until June 30, so instead of sending out of this country tractors which are definitely needed in this country, that power of allocation is extended until the 30th day of June 1947 for the benefit of our own people. The words "automobiles and" were deleted. Any allocation of those are unnecessary under all evidence adduced.

Now, coming to section (c), allocations of the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carrier, I am quite certain that everyone is quite familiar with that particular feature because it relates to allocations of boxcars, freight cars, in fact, any kind of cars for the purpose of transportation. All realize that in some particular sections there has been a shortage of those transportation facilities. The power of allocation of those cars of all characters is continued until June 30, 1947. May I say especially for the benefit of the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] that our cars—boxcars, freight cars, all types of cars—are depreciating rapidly. Many of them are being taken out of use, and they are not being constructed as rapidly as they are being removed from use, because of the age and dilapidated condition of these items of transportation.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. I think the committee has done a very good job. It has had a very severe task before it. However, in connection with this rail-transportation situation, I call the attention of the gentleman to a matter that is very, very serious, and shows exactly what the CPA and ODT are doing under the construction they put on their power under the Second War Powers Act. During the World War, cars for the transportation of propane and other liquefied gas, which as the gentleman knows is used quite extensively, became very short.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that cars used for the transportation of petroleum and oil also were very short.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is right. So the Government built quite a number of these cars for the transportation of propane and allocated them to the various companies throughout the country that were

selling and distributing propane and liquid gases. Back as early as June of 1946 they found that they had a surplus of these cars. Several hundred of these cars were declared surplus and turned over to the War Assets Administration for the purpose of making disposition of them. The cars were already in use by companies that produce or transport liquid gas. Obviously if these cars were surplus, then everyone, I assume, would agree that they were not critical enough for someone to handle under the Second War Powers Act. Someone, however, conceived the idea that if they could get the CPA to declare that these cars which had been declared surplus were still essential to the national defense under the Second War Powers Act, they could bypass what the Congress said in respect to sales of surplus and have them allocated by the CPA and ODT. As a result of that, the CPA in January of this year took jurisdiction under title III of the Second War Powers Act and without making a finding that these cars were necessary for national defense, directed an allocation of them. The cars were all in use by various distributors of this fuel. There were 423 of these cars which had been declared surplus, and they took away some 200 of them which were being used by some of the companies and allocated them to other specific companies. Two of the men who made the allocation were on the pay roll of the company that benefited under the new allocation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Of course, that was a serious blunder on the part of those administering the law.

Mr. RIZLEY. Two of the men who made the allocation were on the pay roll of the company that got the cars. They made the allocation for the ODT. Thus, they used the War Powers Act to take cars away from certain companies who were using the cars in their business and gave them to other competing companies.

There was one little company down in Louisiana or Mississippi that had four of these cars. They took the cars away from that little company and turned them over to some of the larger groups who are in there now competing for the markets and customers of that little company.

Let me point out to the gentleman another case. A veteran of two wars who had been in business distributing propane gas since 1919 came back. He wanted to buy 200 of these cars. He had been advised by WAA they would be for sale at a certain time. In order to bypass him, CPA and ODT, decided that only the companies that had these cars leased were entitled to participate in this new allocation notwithstanding the fact that he was hauling the same kind of gas. They did not permit him to get a single one of those cars.

We had hearings for 2 days before our committee investigating war assets. We thought we had made a case so strong that the allocation would be reconsidered. But we hear this morning that if this act is continued these cars will be reallocated and directed under the same formula and will go to the same people designated in the original and in the same quantity. I understand the Attor-

ney General on Saturday said the order was invalid because it was not made on the basis of a specific finding that the cars were necessary to national defense. I have had information this morning to the effect that, of course, it would be very easy to change that finding. Thus, they will be able to reallocate these cars. And this certain company has two of the allocators on its pay roll making the allocations.

I made that statement for the purpose of pointing out to the gentleman that in times of peace we should be mighty careful what we do in extending the powers of the President which were given to him in time of war because this matter of reallocation of cars does not affect cars only, but actually is a reallocation of markets. They are taking the markets of certain companies that sell and distribute propane gas and turning these markets over to some other companies which receive the 200 cars which they do not now have. The cars are very scarce although they have been declared surplus.

Does the gentleman take the position that the cars owned by the Government and used by these companies in this transportation business of propane is included under the provisions of this extension?

Mr. SPRINGER. My impression, is, and it was the impression of the conferees, insofar as it could be determined, that it embraced all rail transportation.

I wish to thank the gentleman for the observation that he has made. I hope the matters which he has stated on the floor of the House will be brought to the attention of those who have been violating this particular authority which is vested in them.

Under (d) "Allocation of materials or facilities for export which are required to expand production in foreign countries of materials critically needed in the United States"; that provision is identical with the one that was embraced in the measure that was passed by the House.

Coming now to subdivision (e) of section 1501—and if I may I would like to proceed and explain that subsection very briefly and then I will yield for questions—that subsection provides that allocations of materials or facilities which are certified by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments—and may I say in that connection that those items which are necessary to meet international commitments must comply with the two provisions which are contained in this particular conference report; that is, the item must have been allocated on March 24, 1947 or prior thereto. If on that date there was no allocation of the article, then it cannot be revived, but if it was allocated on March 24, 1947, and also, if it is certified by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce as provided in the pending report—it requires a certification by both of those Secretaries—that it is absolutely necessary to meet international commitments, then such allocation may be certified to further continue up until June 30, 1947. But if such article fails to come within

either one of those classifications, that is, if it was not allocated on March 24, 1947, or that it was not absolutely necessary to meet international commitments, which facts must be certified to by both the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, then there could be no allocation of such article, or articles, even for any international commitments.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I would like to go back briefly to the boxcar situation, particularly with reference to the situation which the gentleman has just spoken of with reference to foreign commitments. Out our way we are probably going to lose a hundred million bushels of corn by reason of failure to get boxcars. Let me say to the gentleman, and to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY], that while the ODT has something to do about it, the Association of American Railroads has something to do about allocations. But one of the things that I am concerned with is the question of how many of our new boxcar construction and new locomotives are being shipped out of the country. I wonder if the gentleman can advise me on that.

Mr. SPRINGER. As far as we could ascertain in the hearings, there was no evidence submitted that any are being shipped out of the country at the moment, but the construction of new box cars is far less than the depreciated and depleted cars that are being taken out of use.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I understand from hearings that we had a month ago a very large number of boxcars were being lined up to go out of the country.

Mr. O'HARA. That is my understanding.

Mr. SPRINGER. The information we received was only from the departments of the Government.

Mr. TABER. Did you have Colonel Johnson of the ODT there?

Mr. SPRINGER. He was present and testified. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA. What I wanted to say with reference to that point is that the economy of this country is being seriously impaired by the shortage of railroad transportation. I think we need to keep some of this material here to take care of our own economy.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say I entirely agree with the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota on that subject.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. The observation I wanted to make is this, that without control of any kind they could ship out all the box cars or other equipment they desire. So I take it the gentleman favors some kind of control, because that will prevent the shipping of cars out of the country. The committee has gone on the

theory that we should eliminate controls just as rapidly as possible, but I can see that with no controls at all, they could ship out as many box cars or anything else they may desire regardless of what our needs are at home. The gentleman is entirely correct. I thank him for that observation.

Mr. O'HARA. Until we had these controls I did not know that we were shipping boxcars out of the country.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the chairman for that observation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I should like to get the gentleman's idea on some of the matters involved in subparagraph (e). It states in part that the Secretaries of State and Commerce shall certify in the event they find it necessary to meet international commitments. Referring to foods, grains, fats, oils, and such commodities, to whom do the Secretaries of State and Commerce certify?

Mr. SPRINGER. They would certify to those who were seeking to send these materials out of the country to meet international commitments. That would probably be to the Secretary of Agriculture or to some department which was seeking to send those materials away.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then, if it were the Secretary of Agriculture and it related to food, the Secretaries of State and Commerce would certify such facts to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And that would be the basis of the authority.

It also refers to certain commitments that the Secretaries of State and Commerce certify to. Are those commitments that are in effect and have been made on March 24?

Mr. SPRINGER. Those are commitments that were in existence. There was no definite date fixed as to when the commitment was required to have been made, but it is a commitment which must be in existence between this country and other countries, and at the time this extension becomes effective, if, in fact, the extension requested is granted.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then if the commitment is in existence it will be carried forward under the power of subparagraph (e); but assuming that some new commitment should be made next week or the week after this conference report is approved and the bill signed by the President, would those new commitments made after such approval date come within the purview of this subparagraph (e)?

Mr. SPRINGER. It is not the intent of this act to embrace or recognize future commitments. And may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota that I think the one redeeming feature with respect to this conference report is the shortness of time during which these allocations may continue, up to June 30, 1947. Always remember that the bill which was passed in the House provided that certain items were continued beyond the date of June 30, 1947, and until December 31, 1947. That

date has been shortened to the 30th of June, 1947.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman attempt, if he can, to answer the question about new commitments made after this conference report is approved?

Mr. SPRINGER. This subject was not mentioned in the conference; it was not mentioned by any of the conferees, and it was not intended that it should relate to any new commitments. Commitments already existing prior to the passage of this act would come within its purview, only.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I wish to concur in what the gentleman from Indiana has just said.

It was the intent without any question of doubt that commitments existing at the time this law becomes effective are the only commitments coming within its purview. Otherwise, the President, who plans and directs our foreign policy, could make such allocation as he might see fit at any time by simply making additional commitments.

The language was changed from that of the original bill which said "International arrangements and understandings." That language was too indefinite and the conferees agreed that we should use the word "commitments." What does the word "commitment" mean? It means something we are committed to do at the time we use the word. That is what it is intended to mean.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. The fact of the matter is that that language was employed so there can be no misunderstanding as to our willingness and intention to fulfill commitments already made.

Mr. MICHENER. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If there were any new commitments, they would have to come before the Congress again to get authority and legislation to handle any new commitments?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the gentleman is entirely correct in that assertion.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me ask the gentleman about imports. Does this conference report give any authority to the Government to license, control, or restrict imports of fats and oils and also raw materials from which fats and oils are derived?

Mr. SPRINGER. It does not give any specific authority, and may I say that during the time the hearings were held, especially by subcommittee 4 of the House, the evidence indicated that in connection with fats and oils, which included also the importation of coconuts, and like commodities for crushing purposes, and copra, in that connection it was decided it was not necessary that there be any allocation upon those particular commodities.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me ask the gentleman another question. Does the conference report give any authority to the Government to limit or restrict, direct, or control the processing or manufacture of grains into flour, or fats

and oils into any other commodity in connection with the carrying out of these commitments?

Mr. SPRINGER. It does not except that which might be found under subdivisions D and E. Those are the only places where there could be any possible authority by any stretch of the imagination. It is my judgment that such power is not granted in this report.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman would not want to concede that the Secretary of Agriculture or any other Government official would have the right to put on rationing again or, for instance, to require the manufacture of 80 percent extraction of flour, or such other restrictions, or even set aside orders for meat?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not concede that that authority is embraced in this act, and it is my independent judgment that it is not embraced in it. I know that question was not discussed by the conferees.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then that cannot be read into the conference report, as long as the gentleman who has so ably handled this bill has stated that that authority is not conferred by any language of the conference report?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I want to commend the gentleman and his committee for bringing in this report. By way of recapitulation, in order to clarify the record and avoid possible confusion, may I ask the gentleman to again reassure the House as to the date involved in this legislation. As I understand the gentleman, by this act you are continuing the Second War Powers Act for the items mentioned herein from March 31 to June 30, this year. Is that correct?

Mr. SPRINGER. We are continuing only certain items under title III of that act and for the purposes set forth in this conference report; that is all. That extension extends only until June 30, 1947.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I want to get the date fixed certain and definitely. That is June 30 of this year?

Mr. SPRINGER. This power is extended only to June 30, 1947.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Am I correct in assuming from what the gentleman says that after June 30 of this year this act will not exist for any purpose whatsoever?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. CHENOWETH. It exists to that date only for the articles and for the purposes mentioned therein?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if the gentleman elicited any information as to the commitments with reference to the export of fats and oils in this country, particularly for the next quarter. The reason I ask that is that I have heard rather persistent rumors that during

this next quarter the industries of this country will be facing an absolute and terrific shortage of fats and oils for industrial purposes.

Mr. SPRINGER. There was no information on the question of requirements for export of those particular articles. We asked questions when the hearing was held before the subcommittee but there was no information forthcoming upon that particular subject, so we are without information.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Am I correct in my recollection when I state that when the House bill passed and was substituted for the Senate bill that fertilizer, among other items, was excluded from allocation after March 31?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. It was excluded.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. My second question is whether or not fertilizers, including ammonium nitrate and other nitrates, are included in the conference report for allocation after March 31, and if so, under what title?

Mr. SPRINGER. They are not included, and the only way they could be included would be under (d) or (e), and it is my best judgment that the only place they could be included would be under (e) in order to meet international commitments.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Now, if they are included, as the gentleman states they may be under the language of (e), that would have reference only to the commitments that have been made to conclude up to the 30th of June?

Mr. SPRINGER. That would only have to do with commitments which are already made prior to the passage of this conference report.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Exactly so, but what I am saying is that the power to make the allocations, in order to carry out those commitments, will expire under the terms of this act, including fertilizer, as the gentleman said, if it can be included at all, on June 30.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. As he will remember, the bill which passed the House provided that those items might be extended for allocation purposes until December 31, 1947, but the conferees have reduced that period from December 31 to June 30, 1947.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That did not include fertilizer, because it was excluded in the House bill for the items that could be extended to December 31.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, but section (e) is in that same bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think that that is very important. Will the Civilian Production Administration or its successor under the guise of power to carry out the commitments be able to make allocations that will not be effectuated after June 30, or will the power to make any allocation of any kind be effective after June 30 under the terms of this bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. On June 30, 1947, this bill terminates.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And any power of allocation is terminated?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think our intent ought to be absolutely clear in that regard.

Mr. SPRINGER. And all our machinery with respect to carrying out the allocations will terminate on that date.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think it is exceedingly important that our intent should be clear because the fact is that under the War Powers Act the Civilian Production Administration undertook to provide for the allocation of ammonium nitrates and other fertilizers in this country over the period ending June 30, 1947, before this act expired when by law that power expired on March 31, and I want it definitely understood—and if I am not correct I want to be corrected—that the power of allocation will expire and no allocation that is to be carried out after June 30 will be effective, whether it carries fertilizers, fats, grain, or any other item.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct, and that is my interpretation of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, it has always seemed to me that it was advisable for the Committee on the Judiciary to repeal the War Powers Act as quickly as possible. I think the strongest evidence of the wisdom of that came today when we heard the splendid explanation made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott], of the Committee on Banking and Currency, with respect to sugar. What the Committee on the Judiciary has endeavored to do with this bill has been to terminate these controls on the 30th of June, so that if it should become necessary to make allocations or exercise controls because of the worldwide shortages, then the appropriate legislative committee of the House should take the necessary action. It seems to me and to the other conferees that reducing the date during which this act is operative to June 30 would serve as a notice to those people in interest, those people in the appropriate committees of the House, and those in the executive branch of the Government that the time within which they should take action is short.

The Colmer committee—the House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning—in its carefully considered report on the extension of wartime controls unanimously recommended especially the extension of export and import controls. See the ninth report, pages 99 and 100 and the appendix, part 2, pages 6-8, and the eleventh report, pages 107 and 108.

The reasons for the retention of these controls, either through an extension of the Second War Powers Act or through special legislation dealing specifically with export and import controls and the allocations power necessary to support them, can be briefly stated as three:

First. Persistent shortages on a worldwide basis will make necessary the direction of some commodities in short supply produced in the United States to the areas of greatest relief need and to support our Army and the purposes of our occupation. Buying for these purposes against unlimited world demand would greatly increase government costs and

might not get short supply at the right time to the right place.

Second. The inflationary effects of the removal of both export and import controls will add the most dangerous pressure that can be brought to bear in the wage-price spiral, because of the world shortage of some of the most necessary commodities that enter into the family budget. This shortage would be increased to a marked degree within the American market by the removal of these controls.

Third. The international equilibrium of supplies needed for the most necessary subsistence abroad would be upset "if the overwhelming buying power of the American market, stripped of price controls, were turned loose on the world market for sugar, fats, and oils, and several other commodities in very short supply by the removal of import controls"—Colmer report.

Accompanying this memorandum is a list of potential bottlenecks to maximum production which show, according to the latest Department of Commerce estimates, basic shortages in lead, copper, tin, crude rubber, and so forth. A separate study of steel is not yet available but the indicated shortage against world demand added to American reconversion needs cannot run annually to less than 500,000 tons of strip and sheet steel alone, and may well run nearer to a million tons, if our foreign program, as indicated by the President, is to be fulfilled.

These shortages drastically limit the capacity for building new freight cars, whose growing scarcity at present constitutes the greatest bottleneck to the healthy functioning of American industry. They also seriously affect the locomotive program, not only for this country but for export. A brief note on this is contained on page 7 of the accompanying memo from the Department of Commerce.

Soda ash is one among several chemicals that are having a severe restrictive effect upon American industry and is causing serious deficiencies in production at home and abroad, notably for the glass needed in building and reconstruction. In the manufacture of chemical and caustic soda, it is also a limiting factor, if present shortages continue, in the production of nonferrous metals, pulp and paper, soap, water softeners, some types of textiles, and petroleum products.

On the food and agricultural commodities front, the severest shortage which is producing industrial bottlenecks, as well as food shortages, occurs in the vegetable oils. This is treated on pages 11 and 12 with statistics on page 13 of the accompanying memo, which shows industrial shortages that would be increased largely by exports of fats and oils.

A world shortage of grain and cereal products has produced the highest prices in history, largely because of the approaching or anticipated removal of export controls. The immediate effect can be seen in the rise of the price of a loaf of bread to 15 cents, with prospects of going still higher.

Many other users of grain, including corn for the corn starch used by most in-

dustries, are facing serious difficulties of supply comparable to the industrial bottlenecks which are due to a shortage of fats and oils.

Fiber shortages on a world scale still persist in hemp, sisal, and other materials used for binder twine and rope. Cotton has reached once more the highest price since just after the Civil War in a speculative market resulting from prospective disappearance of controls.

In most of these shortage factors a removal of all barriers from the products of the United States for export would open competitive bidding by starved markets, rapidly exhausting the dollar exchange available, but in the meantime further temporarily inflating the American market with the attendant dangers of producing an inflationary crash.

Even in the consumer durable goods and in other American products uncontrolled exports present grave dangers. A second-hand American car commands a price of \$20,000 in Syria today. Although this is an extreme instance, there are many indications of a general worldwide demand that would drain short American supplies before the pipe lines are filled for the domestic market, with the inevitable accompanying increase in prices.

The pipe lines are filling in many cases very rapidly to the point where the removal of export controls will afford no real danger, but the process is selective and differs widely with differing products and materials.

It is manifestly impossible to shape adequate legislation to supply the selectivity necessary in the extension of the Second War Powers Act. It seems absolutely essential, therefore, that the Second War Powers Act should be extended from the date of its termination, which is now set for March 31, on an emergency basis, to the date set for the expiration of the National Defense Act of June 28, 1940, which has been extended to June 30, 1947. The critical character of the international situation, as well as the short time limits available for considered action by Congress both denote the wisdom of the extension of the Second War Powers Act to June 30, 1947, so that mature consideration may be given to adequate new legislation on a selective basis.

POTENTIAL BOTTLENECKS TO MAXIMUM PRODUCTION—SELECTED LIST OF COMMODITIES—NOTE

The following material was extracted from a report prepared by the Office of Domestic Commerce for the Secretary of Commerce entitled "Preliminary Report on Potential Bottlenecks to Maximum Production." Several revisions and additions have been made to bring the material up to date. The report was not prepared in the detail needed to gain a full understanding of the industrial bottlenecks situation but to establish some preliminary facts to be expanded upon at some later date. Because of their special significance, certain commodities, such as steel, have been omitted from this presentation.

SUMMARY

It should be possible to achieve maximum output in most industries in 1947. However, a number of weak spots are still apparent which may cause continued

shortages in certain products beyond this year. The greatest potential deterrent toward balancing supply and demand factors is the possibility of a recurring series of strikes. However, this brief summary deals with only material and production bottlenecks and assumes availability of the full labor force.

Bottlenecks which may cause continued shortages over an extended period fall into two categories:

First. Lack of adequate plant capacities: It is our considered opinion that total current production facilities for finished products and expansion under way are ample to meet most of the demand during 1947, provided the necessary raw materials and components are produced in adequate volume. Two possible exceptions to this are steel and soda ash where any delay in plant construction programs may delay a balancing until sometime in 1948.

Second. Basic raw materials shortages: The remaining deterrents to full production can be found in the supply situation of a small number of basic raw materials. Typically, the short-supply position of these materials result not only from high domestic demand but from the chaotic conditions surrounding production in foreign areas. The solution to some of these shortages rests in a large degree upon increased production in foreign countries.

LEAD

Lead presents the most serious problem of all the metals, both short-term and long-term, both domestically and internationally. Consumption in 1946 was 30 percent below demand and, under the best outlook for 1947, supplies will still be 22 to 25 percent short of needs approximating 1,300,000 short tons. The unsettled state of world production and supplies complicates any appraisal of the domestic situation.

World production is substantially below prewar and war levels, for the following reasons: the depletion of developed ore reserves, the absence of new discoveries, the destruction of certain mining properties, as in Burma, and interruptions to production resulting from labor disturbances. At the same time, world demand is at a very high level, and shortages are expected to continue for some time.

The demand pressures derive principally from the following: First, a high level of demand on the part of lead-consuming industries, including some carry-over from 1946 as a result of the loss of production because of strikes in some of the mines, smelters, and refineries in this country as well as a mine strike in Mexico, the principal source of United States imports; second, continued limited mine production in this country because of the depletion of reserves and manpower deficits; and third, very limited imports because of the world shortage and international competition or commitments, as in the case of a shift of Australian lead which was an important part of United States supply during the war to Great Britain. Thus, despite the Government subsidy of imports during most of 1946 at the world price, receipts into this country were only a little more than one-half of 1945 imports.

With the end of control, the cessation of Government imports shifted the responsibility for supplementing domestic supplies to private industry, at the same time reinstating the tariff duty. While higher prices should bring forth some increase in supply, both from domestic and foreign sources, consumer resistance may be met with the possibility of substitutes. Some substitution has already been operative, as in the switch to titanium in the manufacture of paints, and the use of copper and brass tubing for lead pipe. Another possible substitution may be made through the use of iron carbonyl in the place of tetraethyl lead in connection with high-test gasoline production.

While increased substitution would have the effect of reducing pressure on the short supply of lead, in many of its uses no satisfactory substitute has been developed. This is true in the case of storage batteries, which is the principal user of lead, taking about 30 percent of total consumption in a normal peacetime pattern. While the production of storage batteries has been maintained at fairly high levels through the allocation of lead to that purpose in the past, there is no assurance that in a free market continued satisfactory production can be kept up. Under the stringent supply conditions that still exist, an increase to one type of use is simply a drain on another.

Salient statistics on lead, 1939-46

[In short tons lead content]

	Domestic mine production ¹	Domestic secondary production ¹	Imports ²		Exports pigs and bars ³	Total stocks, end of period ⁴	Consumption ⁴
			Ore, flue dust, and matte and base bullion	Pigs, bars, and scrap			
1937-39 average.....	415,380	247,147	44,566	4,606	74,392	(9)	630,567
1940.....	456,613	260,346	91,461	38,522	23,755	(6)	782,000
1941.....	460,764	397,416	109,711	329,350	14,359	268,618	1,050,000
1942.....	495,824	323,001	137,191	389,233	1,940	445,684	1,026,672
1943.....	453,113	342,094	87,538	247,951	2,003	390,716	
1944.....	416,817	331,416	104,924	233,865	15,523	287,531	1,051,601
1945.....	390,820	363,039	71,628	254,862	1,407	292,656	
1946.....	332,478	365,966	28,836	104,778	597	201,644	956,476

¹ Bureau of Mines.

² Bureau of the Census.

³ Civilian Production Administration.

⁴ 1937-41, American Bureau of Metal Statistics; 1942-46, Civilian Production Administration.

⁵ 1939 only.

⁶ Not available.

COPPER

Copper demand will approach 2,100,000 short tons in 1947, with supplies 25 to 30 percent short of this amount. The maximization of all supply factors would need to be realized to meet the full demand and this does not appear likely. Consumption in 1946 was maintained only by heavy withdrawals from stocks.

To meet 1947 needs domestic primary production would have to exceed 800,000 tons and imports rise to about the same amount. Production will be curtailed by a continued shortage of labor, war depletion of working deposits, and the removal of some marginal operations in the absence of subsidy support. Copper prices are not expected to rise sufficiently to maintain all the marginal operations kept going by the wartime premium price plan. Secondary production should be somewhat higher and may approach 600,000 tons.

The foreign supplies which will be made available to us is most unpredictable. Imports are very important in

meeting our current high level of demand—double prewar requirements—which has made the United States a net importer of copper. With the Government no longer the sole importer in a pooled world market, receipts will be limited by competition with foreign purchasers and the import duties on entries into this country. Imports in 1946 were sharply reduced as a result of labor difficulties in Chile, our principal foreign source, as well as from diversion of part of the Chilean output to other prewar customers. Supplies of Belgian Congo and Canadian copper, which came to the United States during the war, are now being partially diverted to Great Britain.

The shortage of copper which will last at least through 1947, will continue to restrict production in many instances, particularly in the durable goods field, just as it has ever since VJ-day. High demands by the construction industry, power companies, appliance manufacturers, in automobile components, and so forth, will maintain a steady pressure on inadequate supplies.

Salient statistics on copper

(Short tons)

Year	Domestic mine production ¹	Domestic secondary production ¹	Imports		Stocks of refined copper, end of year ²	Exports of refined copper	Apparent consumption ⁴
			Ores and concentrates ³	Other manufactured copper ³			
1937-39 average.....	709,360	320,000	24,528	196,785	(9)	346,129	904,000
1940.....	578,086	334,000	31,222	335,775	127,300	355,431	1,292,000
1941.....	958,149	413,000	42,784	677,924	140,273	105,602	2,001,000
1942.....	1,080,061	427,000	67,678	714,682	152,416	131,406	2,032,000
1943.....	1,090,818	428,000	68,709	667,570	270,352	175,859	1,907,000
1944.....	972,549	457,000	59,874	706,200	397,417	68,373	1,774,000
1945.....	772,894	560,000	57,935	838,261	548,270	48,563	1,839,000
1946.....	602,355	540,000	30,730	329,068	168,610	52,629	1,794,000

¹ Bureau of Mines; 1946 secondary production estimated.² Bureau of the Census.³ Civilian Production Administration.⁴ Computed by Office of Domestic Commerce.⁵ Not available.

TIN

A foreseeable new supply of 85,000 long tons of tin in 1947 to meet a probable demand of at least 100,000 tons indicates a deficit of about 15 percent.^{1,2} The shortage will mean the continuation of the serious restrictive effects on consumption which were experienced during the war and up to the present time. The shortage is world-wide, resulting from drastically reduced output in the principal producing areas of both metal and concentrates.

The United States produces only negligible quantities of tin from domestic mines and is, therefore, dependent upon foreign sources for primary tin, either in the form of metal or concentrates. The latter are processed in the only tin smelter in this country, which is located in Texas. This smelter was built in anticipation of the loss of far-eastern sources, such as developed after the beginning of the war with Japan. In 1946 this smelter produced about 45,000 tons. To help alleviate the world shortage of tin, as well as to provide a bargaining point with the British and Dutch, who are in control of most of the tin producing areas in the Far East, it appears advisable to maintain the Texas smelter in operation for some years to come, even under Government subsidy. The chief source of con-

centrates has been Bolivia, although the relatively low grade of Bolivian tin has made it necessary to mix it with material from the Far East.

The current world shortage began in 1941 with the invasion of the far-eastern producing areas by the Japanese. The total salvage of tin from the quantities produced under the Japanese regime during the war amounted to about 41,000 tons, while production in the Far East in 1946 is estimated at from 24,000 to 30,000 tons. These quantities compare with an annual prewar output in that area of 160,000 tons. This poor showing, a result of several factors—the condition of the mines, lack of equipment, political unrest, inadequate food supplies—has been the primary factor in the world shortage. While output in 1947 is expected to be improved, full production is not anticipated before 1948 or 1949.

The principal use of tin is in the manufacture of tin plate. The harmful effects of the shortage have been lessened in this respect by the increased use of electrolytic tin plating, which requires less tin than the older method of hot dipping. In most other uses tin is so small a part, in volume, of the finished product in which it is contained as not to appear significant. Actually, however, as a component, with lead, for

solder used in automobile manufacture, its shortage has been a serious bottleneck.

Salient statistics for tin, 1937-46

(In long tons tin content)

Year	World production	Domestic production (primary and secondary)	Imports of metal	Exports	Total domestic stocks, end of period	Apparent consumption
1937-39 ¹	183,667	24,700	69,305	(9)	(9)	77,444
1940.....	236,600	31,691	124,816	(9)	(9)	67,154
1941.....	240,000	39,339	140,873	(9)	143,370	134,695
1942.....	125,000	50,068	26,753	244	144,361	85,687
1943.....	127,000	55,289	11,919	398	125,544	80,339
1944.....	105,000	59,984	13,338	405	107,212	89,969
1945.....	87,000	71,875	8,440	708	91,623	83,583
1946.....	90,000	68,089	15,258	859	77,925	80,234

¹ Average.² Tin content of ores used direct to make alloys not included.³ Preliminary estimate.⁴ Not available.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines, Civilian Production Administration, and U. S. Bureau of the Census.

RAILROAD EQUIPMENT

The shortage of freight cars is probably the worst in the capital-goods field. The exacting war demands on the railroad industry were met, but at the expense of wear and tear on inadequate equipment. Today, as one of the results of that experience, there are about 50,000 fewer cars in operation than at the beginning of 1946, in the face of unprecedented peacetime demands on the transportation system. In fact, without the wartime regulations which brought intensified use of freight cars, the present requirements in terms of cars are even greater than during the war.

The Association of American Railroads has announced that replies from members indicate they could use an additional 130,000 news cars at once. Estimates of ODT set replacement requirements at several hundred thousand cars over the next few years.

The freight-car-building industry had 90,000 cars on order as of March 12, enough to keep it running at theoretical capacity—about 15,000 units per month—for some 6 months. There are, however, no expectations that such capacity operations will be achieved. Without enough steel to go around to all consumers, the program of the industry calls for enough materials to produce 10,000 domestic cars per month, which compares with the 3,500 per month rate of 1946.

This present program, more than three times the 1946 average monthly production, is one which has been expanded since the first of the year as a result of a series of conferences between the car builders, steel producers, ODT, CPA, and a subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Some doubt has been raised as to the supply of components other than steel but preliminary findings of ODT indicate the 10,000 car-a-month schedule can be reached by July. The most serious threat to the schedule appears to be pig iron which is required for 8,000

of the 10,000 sets of wheels needed monthly as well as for air brakes.

Difficulties in the passenger car field extend beyond steel and other basic materials into a serious lack of components. During 1946 cars which were nearly completed were held up by a shortage of electrical and air-conditioning equipment—motors, blowers, fans, fitting panels, transformers, generators, lighting fixtures—curtains, carpets, linoleum, plumbing fixtures, and so forth. The same situation is expected to plague the industry during at least part of 1947. The production of passenger cars averaged about 60 cars per month in 1946, considerably below capacity.

Locomotive builders are similarly troubled by shortages of basic materials, particularly steel and cooper. Boiler plates and tubes are among the most difficult items to obtain. Components, such as electrical equipment used on Diesel-electrics, are likewise short. Due to lack of materials one leading locomotive firm recently furloughed 75 percent of its personnel for 1 week.

Salient figures on railroad freight cars

	Cars delivered ¹ —		Cars in service, end of year ²	Cars retired ³
	For domestic service	For export		
1937-39 average.....	39,700	771	1,720,674	85,944
1940.....	62,341	1,734	1,675,080	72,030
1941.....	80,623	2,386	1,725,437	40,781
1942.....	62,873	8,529	1,769,120	70,059
1943.....	31,836	43,117	1,780,520	25,086
1944.....	43,003	38,759	1,794,135	30,987
1945.....	43,864	10,658	1,784,674	45,840
1946.....	41,967	17,631	1,739,930	78,093

¹ American Railway Car Institute.

² Association of American Railroads, class I railroads only.

SODA ASH

A probable output of 4,500,000 short tons of soda ash this year may fail to meet all demands by approximately 250,000 tons. There is little likelihood of the deficit being met by imports from areas in a more serious supply position than that in this country. Normally imports add only negligible amounts to our domestic supply. Several new plants are under construction but, while some should be in production by the end of the year, no substantial increase in production is expected before 1948. A speeding up of the building of these plants which might be effected will help alleviate the short supply outlook.

The largest consuming areas restricted by lack of soda ash are the glass industry which takes 25 to 30 percent of the output, and the production of caustic soda and the manufacture of other chemicals, each taking about a fifth of soda ash production. Other smaller uses are in the production of nonferrous metals, pulp and paper, soap, water softeners, industrial and household uses, textiles, and petroleum products.

Foreign demands in excess of local production exert a pressure for export in the United States market, but during 1946 outgoing shipments amounted to only 1½ percent of our output. There is a world-wide shortage of soda ash. The United Kingdom, formerly a lead-

ing world producer of this chemical, is faced with a very critical situation, and its exports are at a low ebb. Continental countries report serious deficits of soda ash—Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. France, although in an improved position, has been producing at less than the prewar monthly average. The exchange of Italian soda ash for United States coal has been suggested as a partial solution, but the possibility of such an arrangement appears remote. In Japan the current rate of production is low and none is at present available for export.

Salient statistics on soda ash, 1937-46 [Thousands of short tons]

	Production	Exports	Producers' stocks, end of year	Consumption
1937-39 average.....	12,948	(2)	(?)	12,964
1940.....	(?)	59	(?)	(?)
1941.....	3,724	83	39	(?)
1942.....	3,925	64	109	(?)
1943.....	4,571	153	27	4,696
1944.....	4,718	79	62	4,892
1945.....	4,557	70	36	4,581
1946.....	4,497	67	(?)	4,490

¹ 1939 only.

² Not available.

³ As of Sept. 30.

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, except consumption data which are from Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering Magazine.

FATS AND OILS BOTTLENECKS

Total supplies of fats and oils in the 1946-47 crop year, ending in September 1947, will fall short of unrestricted demand for 10,700,000,000 pounds by about 1,600,000,000, with per capita consumption at about 90 percent of the 1937-41 average.

Some realization of the effects of this limitation of supplies is obtained from the list of the industries whose output is restricted because of insufficient fats and oils. In the edible field, shortening, margarine, cooking and salad oils, salad dressings, and mayonnaise are the largest users. In inedible uses, soap, paints and varnishes, and linoleum and oilcloth are most important. To the American businessman the restricted supplies mean the inability to meet the current demand and the necessity of paying higher prices to obtain raw materials for his operations. This particularly affects the small businessman who is unable to store large amounts of fats and must, therefore, enter the market for current supplies. The lack of paints and linoleum has an indirect effect in connection with the desired expansion of housing, and adds to the difficulties encountered by the construction industry. To the consumer the restricted output is reflected not only in lower availability but also in a gradually ascending retail price.

An indication of the efforts being made by the American industry to overcome the bottlenecks imposed by current low supplies is represented in the field of soap and soap-type products. Any marked increase in production of soap is dependent upon increased imports of copra from the Philippine Islands. Soap sales in 1946 of 2,300,000,000 pounds were the lowest since 1935. However, output of soap-type products is increasing.

These are called synthetic detergents and are made from fatty oils and from petroleum derivatives. The growth of output from petroleum derivatives is progressing at such a rate that they may permanently cut into the market for the more traditional types of soap made principally from domestic tallow and grease and coconut oil from Philippine copra. The position of the small soaper under such conditions would be particularly difficult.

The current rate of disappearance of our principle edible oils shows the difficulties of the shortening and margarine industries. Based on an estimated 1946-47 production of 950,000,000 pounds of cottonseed oil and beginning stocks of 306,000,000 pounds, total supplies of this product in the current season are 1,256,000,000 pounds. By March 1, 1947, 63 percent of total supplies had been consumed, compared with 47 percent disappearance in the same period of the 1945-46 crop year. In the case of soybean oil, by March 1, 1947, we had consumed 41.6 percent of our supplies, compared with 35.4 percent utilized in the same period of the preceding season, with consumption currently increasing. Thus, it is clear that supplies of edible oils are disappearing at a rate in excess of that justified by crop-year estimates, and before the end of the season, probably in June and July, many members of the industry will be forced to curtail output even further or stop operating.

In the drying oil field the current purchase from Argentina of 40,000 tons of linseed oil should carry the drying oil industry over on a limited scale until the receipt of supplies from the new crop. Short supplies of pigments also act as a deterrent to increased output of paint products.

Two major reasons for the current bottlenecks in fats and oils are the relatively low output from domestic materials in the 1946-47 crop year and the necessity for shipping supplies from this country and from our normal import sources to European nations. Production from domestic materials in the 1946-47 crop year is expected to reach 9,200,000,000 pounds, which while larger than the 8,900,000,000 produced in 1945-46, is 2,000,000,000 pounds under the wartime peak in 1943-44. Part of the reason for this lower production is the emphasis placed on production of cereal grains for shipment overseas, with which vegetable oils seeds compete for acreage.

Although the United States was on a net import basis in 1947 by 220,000,000 pounds, the first time since 1942, this was only a small amount as compared with prewar net imports of some 1,500,000,000 pounds. The necessity for curtailing our position is the result of fat shortages abroad. World supplies in 1947 are estimated at 15 to 20 percent below the average for the immediate prewar years, and countries are reported to be giving fat imports a priority second only to wheat. Part of the reason for the reduced world output is tied up with the policies of countries with colonial sources of supply. These countries have shown a determination to retain the exportable supplies of their colonies and at the same time

have not taken steps to encourage production. The maintenance of price stability has been given precedence to increasing output through raising the prices for fats and oils.

As a result of the lowered world output countries have been obtaining supplies from areas normally the source of United States imports. This applies principally to the Republic of the Philippines. Before the war the United States obtained some 80 percent of Philippine exports of copra. In 1947, if the tentative allocations of the IEFC are carried out, this country will receive only about 40 percent of the total shipped.

Thus the availability of fats and oils in the United States is directly affected by

actions in overseas countries. It is recognized that this country's per capita consumption at about 90 percent of prewar is considerably more favorable than that of many European nations which report about 75 percent to 80 percent of prewar usage. However, the United States has taken all possible steps to build up domestic supplies through support price programs and development of Philippine supplies through the Copra Export Marketing Corporations. It therefore becomes a matter of policy how much domestic operations should be curtailed in the interests of nations which for one reason or another cannot be considered to have taken all possible steps to develop their own supplies.

Salient statistics on fats and oils
(In millions of pounds)

Year	Primary fats and oils (crude bases)		Stocks, end of period	Foreign trade ¹		
	Production from domestic materials	Domestic disappear- ance		Imports	Exports and reexports	Net imports
1937-41 average.....	8,230	9,769	2,303	2,060	472	1,588
1942.....	9,983	10,308	2,017	973	937	36
1943.....	10,847	10,089	2,151	1,028	1,847	-550
1944.....	10,839	10,306	2,156	1,045	1,589	-544
1945.....	9,427	9,843	1,726	931	1,026	-95
1946.....	8,846	9,331	1,264	999	779	220

¹ Includes oil content of oilseeds, other products on full-weight basis.

Source: Derived from U. S. Department of Commerce figures except production of butter and lard obtained from U. S. Department of Agriculture.

(Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The bill we had the other day provided for some terminations on December 31. This bill provides for terminations of all allocations of so-called critical materials and of regulations now in effect upon June 30 of this year.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am wondering if the committee can tell us how soon the different departments of the Government will be in asking for a continuation of some of these controls.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is one question that I cannot answer, of course, and the conferees cannot answer.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman does anticipate, does he not, that they will be in asking for the continuation of some of these controls?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is speculative entirely. No one can tell.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the deadline is the 30th of June. These controls expire then. That gives these agencies which might desire to ask for a continuation of controls an opportunity to go before the several legislative committees having jurisdiction just as they have done before the Committee

on Banking and Currency on sugar this morning, before the Committee on Armed Services on rubber the other day, and before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on shipping; so that after all is said and done, the policy of the country rests in the hands of Congress, and the gentleman and I and the others here must act affirmatively if controls are to be continued beyond June 30.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If all controls are dropped on June 30, how many persons presently employed to handle these controls will be eliminated from the pay roll?

Mr. SPRINGER. There will be several thousand of them. I had a superficial report from the various departments, from the ODT and the CPA. As I recall, they had already reduced the number more than 3,000, and, of course, on June 30 several thousand people will go off the payroll.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Lord hasten the day.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the few crumbs of comfort that are contained in the conference report are deeply appreciated. There is only one addition to the House bill, and that is to allocate abaca and the agave fiber and cordage.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always so happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. That also will result in cutting into the amount of manila available. The amount that has been purchased since private purchases started

has run up from 30,000 bales a month to 60,000 bales, and now it will go back.

Mr. HOBBS. Of course, we are always illumined by and appreciate the knowledge that we get from the distinguished gentleman. That is exactly why we need the allocation power. We need it to keep those two large firms that have a monopoly from getting all of the hard fiber without which we cannot possibly have a string to tie up the farmers' crops, a string that will not stretch and "spill the beans." We are not as dumb as some people think we are.

Mr. TABER. It will simply accentuate your shortage because you will have less hemp to manufacture into rope.

Mr. HOBBS. But such as may be, whether much or little, will give the small businessman a chance to stay in business who does not have the purchasing power nor the mighty organizations of their dominating competitors.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am always happy to yield to you, sir, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, who deserted us and whose association we enjoyed so greatly when he would associate with us of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'HARA. I express my appreciation to the gentleman for his remarks, but I am very much concerned with not only the question of allocation but the question of how long that allocation will go on. Consider fertilizers and fats and oils. We have been told that allocation definitely ends on June 30. For how long a time can this authority under the War Powers Act last? Will the gentleman state whether that means that delivery is to be made by that time or can they go on allocating for 5 years under this extension of the War Powers Act?

Mr. HOBBS. For the first time since my mind has been occupied with a study of this bill, and that means for several years, that is the only one question that I cannot possibly answer. I can answer almost any question that may be propounded at any time by anybody because if I do not know, I can say so, and that is an answer to the question.

But here we have a situation where we are solemnly assured that only the outstanding commitments that have been made will come under subsection E of title III. Therefore, no commitment that was made, so Mr. WHITTINGTON's argument runs, which is to be performed after today—in other words, by midnight tonight—every allocation that has been made and every commitment that has been made will expire with today. Then we are just as solemnly assured by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee who handled the bill that no other commitments can be made after midnight tonight under any circumstances to extend for as long as it takes you to snap your fingers, and, therefore, it would seem that if both of those statements be logical and true these sections amount to less than nothing—a few wasted words—for no control is vested by the conference report that was not being exercised on March 24, 1947.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOBBS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman, but I do have a statement which I wish to make, sir.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman for yielding so much of his time but the point that still bothers me is that we do not know as far as the economy of this country is concerned what allocations have been made and for how long a time, let us say on fertilizers and fats and oils. They could extend for a long period of time. Am I correct in that?

Mr. HOBBS. I do not know, sir. I do not know whether there is any power under heaven for one second of time to make any allocation even if it had been made before today or if it might be attempted tomorrow. My judgment about the matter is that it is highly probable that any commitments—and that is a strong word—any commitment that has been made by this Government, not only I but every other gentleman of this House, and particularly including the gentleman from Minnesota who has just asked the question, ought to be glad, if the commitment has been made by our Government, no matter whether we agree with it or not, to live up to it "if it takes the hide." I believe that would be the gentleman's attitude and I know it is mine. Now, how long, under the technical construction of this conference report that power will last, or that authority extend, I do not know and I do not believe anybody else knows.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman mentioned my name. Will he permit me to say what my idea is?

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir. I appreciate it, but the chairman of the subcommittee also rose and before the gentleman did on this particular question and therefore I will have to yield to my genial friend from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman very much.

May I say to the gentleman from Alabama and for the benefit of the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Minnesota, under the original act, the Second War Powers Act of 1942, does not the gentleman believe that any allocations made under that act could not be made beyond the date when the act was to expire?

Mr. HOBBS. I am perfectly sure that no allocation could have been made legally, which was made after the date on which the act was fixed to expire by law.

Mr. SPRINGER. And does not the distinguished gentleman from Alabama now state that the same rule would obtain with reference to this date of June 30, 1947?

Mr. HOBBS. I certainly do. Both of those things are perfectly clear. As far as whether or not they would have the power during this interim period to make a commitment that might extend beyond June 30, I do not know. I am perfectly sure that there has never been any attempt to do so; there never would be and there could not be a legal attempt to thwart the purposes of the law in order to do that thing, and there would not be. But I can very easily see that if you had a cargo of any one of the materials that were subject to allocation until June 30,

on the high seas, and because of a storm, perhaps shipwrecked the vessel, you could not stop that shipment nor would you want to, if there was a commitment of your Government that it should be delivered.

Mr. O'HARA. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly, sir, I'm glad to.

Mr. O'HARA. I would agree with the gentleman on the seriousness of commitments, but I do think that we should write into this report that the delivery date had to be by June 30, 1947; that if it was not made by that time, I do not think it should be made.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. I want to say two or three things, if you please. Every bit of my time has been taken up on this one thing that does not amount to a hill of beans.

The organized beer or liquor interests are behind two of these deletions, I am sure, without intent on the part of our conferees or the committee. It is just as plain as the nose on your face that we are going to be short nearly 12,000,000 bushels in our international commitments, if we drop, as we have dropped in this conference report and under our bill, our commitment on grain and grain products. We are going to give them to the distillers, the brewers and to the makers of mixed feeds. The same thing is true of rice. We are not so utterly foolish as to have used any of these powers unwisely, in the sense of business propositions. What did we do when we committed to Cuba 3,800,000 bags of rice? We got ten times that much in our return commitments for sugar, and you could not have passed the bill you passed here for sugar control but for our exercise of this allocation of rice to Cuba. I know that only 1 percent of the world's rice is produced in this country, but such as we had gave we unto them, and we got ten times the value for the American table. But because the brewers wished that rice, for the manufacture of beer, the power to allocate rice has been omitted.

The same thing is true in several other matters that have been cut out. In fertilizer we get back in production abroad over ten times the value of that fertilizer here, and we cannot get sufficient nitrates in this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. We are pathetically short of nitrates. We cannot get them here without the trading ability that this law has been giving us under these allocation powers.

On word more in closing. You are wiping out the general power which the President asked for, the power to act in the event of a sudden emergency declared by him to exist. In such a case, no matter how desperate the need, the

President is now being denied the right to do anything. We do not begrudge a day of the mourning period that John L. Lewis has just declared. We all bow in sorrow, and real grief, with the members of his union and their friends in deploring the Illinois catastrophe. We are not saying one word against that, but we have here an illustration of the need of this general power which has been carried for years in this act and which I submit wholly without regard to this dividing aisle, we ought to be glad to continue. Suppose the coal strike which is threatened—not this mourning period, but a strike—should come; suppose something else of the kind comes, do you mean to tell me that you wish to deny to the President of the United States his expressed desire to have continued his power to save such situations? Of course you do not, all of us trust him. Yet this conference report kills that power. There are millions of tons of coal on the docks of New York today consigned overseas by private contracts. In the event of a coal strike we would need every ton for home consumption, to keep public utilities running, and to serve essential needs in a thousand lines, yet no one has any power to stop a single shipment.

Illustrations of the need of such a power might be multiplied, and, as you think on such possibilities, will be multiplied in your mind.

This conference report must be voted up or down. It cannot now be amended. But we can resolve that we will not let this mistake continue to haunt us with fear of the real dangers we can utterly rout by a simple bill restoring this one emergency power.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] states that the United States exports much less fertilizer than we import. I know that such information has been furnished Members of Congress. If such a situation obtained, it was in normal times. It does not obtain now in Mississippi insofar as Chilean nitrate or ammonium nitrate is concerned. Nor does not now obtain with respect to Canadian nitrates or cyanamid.

One-third of the ammonium nitrate available for Mississippi and the lower Mississippi Valley was allocated for export and for the Allied Nations by the Civilian Production Administration for the period July 1946 to June 30, 1947. There were no material amounts of Chilean nitrate imported the latter part of 1946, and there have been delays on account of strikes and inability to obtain ships in 1947. I am advised that about 550,000 tons of Chilean will be imported by June 30, 1947. At the same time, I am informed that the ammonium plants reactivated by the Army will produce for the first 6 or 8 months of 1947 approximately 600,000 tons of ammonium nitrate to be shipped overseas by the Army to the occupied countries. I am familiar with the situation in Mississippi and the lower Mississippi Valley. But little Canadian nitrates and cyanamid are being shipped into the Delta of Mississippi. The capacity for

ammonium nitrate of the TVA, Spencer, and Lion is around 45,000 tons a month. The Army's capacity is 65,000 tons a month. There has been much delay already in the importations of Chilean, and Canadian shipments are being canceled and delayed as stated. It is not an accurate picture, therefore, to say that so far as the Delta of Mississippi and the lower Mississippi Valley are concerned, exports are less than imports.

Under the bill as it passed the House, fertilizers were included, but section e, included in the Conference Report, obtained in the House bill. It is as follows:

(e) allocations of materials or facilities which are certified by the Secretaries of State and Commerce as necessary to meet international commitments: *Provided*, That any materials or facilities which were not being allocated on March 24, 1947, shall not be allocated hereafter under the provisions of such title III.

The commitments of the Secretary of State are one thing; allocations are another. The Civilian Production Administration undertook to make allocations of about 15,000 tons each from the three plants supplying the lower Mississippi Valley from January 1 to June 30, 1947, after one-third of their production from July 1946 to December 1946 had been allocated directly and indirectly for export.

The intent of Congress, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] has stated, is clear:

First. Fertilizer, including ammonium nitrate, could not be allocated unless it was being allocated on March 24, 1947.

Second. The Civilian Production Administration was allocating on March 24, 1947, and stated that the allocations to June 30, 1947, would be sufficient. The intent is that additional allocations cannot be made.

Third. The further intent is that no allocation can be made for delivery by a plant of fertilizer, including ammonium nitrate after June 30, 1947.

The Civilian Production Administration undertook to allocate to June 30, 1947, although the War Powers Act expired on March 31, 1947. The intent is that there can be no allocation for delivery or shipment after June 30, 1947.

All commitments by the State Department are conditioned upon the Department being able to obtain the materials and facilities. There is a universal shortage of fertilizer for all domestic purposes. I am sympathetic with the Allied Nations, but the allocations have been made for the Allied Nations. The Army is manufacturing for the occupied countries. Domestic growers are entitled to consideration, and inasmuch as allocations are not being made to domestic growers, they should not be made to foreign growers. Personally, I oppose the continuance of the allocation of fertilizer. I regret that the language of the House bill was not retained which excluded fertilizer, but I concur in the intent as expressed by Chairman SPRINGER that no allocation will be effective for export or delivery after June 30, 1947. The State Department will have the same privilege of obtaining fertilizer as American farmers. It is not fair to the

American farmers to make allotments for foreign commitments when no allotments are made to domestic producers, with the result that many domestic producers today are without fertilizers, especially in the Mississippi Delta and the lower Mississippi valley, where only nitrogen can be used to advantage. Mixed fertilizers are not suitable to alluvial or Delta soils.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, with all due respect to the committee, with the one problem which is left open, in my opinion, and that is the question that is left on the matter of the extent of these allocations, as to time of delivery.

It has been made plain that the power to allocate ends on June 30. It is perfectly obvious to me that if we are going to say the power to allocate should end on June 30, the power to go beyond that date in the matter of delivery should end then also, and it is my interpretation that the power to deliver beyond June 30 should be limited to the same period; namely, that delivery under foreign commitments would have to be made prior to June 30, 1947. To hold otherwise would create a rather ridiculous situation which would not only be inconsistent with the will of Congress to terminate controls but would be absolutely contradictory to the express intent, for we are involved and concerned in the termination of controls over commodities which are scarce but which vitally affect the industry and the economy of this country in scarce items such as fats and oils and fertilizer.

So that there will be no misunderstanding in our vote upon this report and the limitations and termination of controls and the matter of delivery of commitments made, unless I hear to the contrary I will assume that the deliveries must be made under commitments by June 30 or such commitments will terminate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, my interest in the termination of these war powers is centered primarily in the field of strategic and critical materials for the national defense. I have just finished 8 years' service on a special committee dealing with those particular materials. The committee in charge of that matter now is under the chairmanship of the able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]. I trust that committee will go into this matter very carefully and critically with a view of conserving our strategic and critical materials.

I have some reason to be alarmed about the situation. I picked up an announcement of the Office of Temporary Controls of January 29 in which it was stated that they had authorized the licensing and exporting of 65,000 tons of tin plate and the article went on to say that this is in addition to 55,000 tons authorized in September and in addition

to some other authorizations. At the same time we are down on our backs in the matter of tin and although I understand only about 1 percent of tin plate is tin, we are so totally unprepared for any national emergency in our supply of strategic materials and especially as to tin supply that I am shocked we would export any of it.

Although I am now serving on the Ways and Means Committee, and am no longer serving on the committee having jurisdiction over strategic materials, I am going to keep on watching this matter of a strategic materials stock pile in the interest of the national defense, and will go into that matter much more fully with the committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]. I am not going to let the matter drop. I cannot conceive of a situation where America today can think that it has one pound of tin available for export; yet they have licensed the exportation of tin and have not made a move yet to acquire the stock pile of tin as provided in Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

As I stated, I have had 8 years of experience with this matter, starting with Public Law 117 of the Seventy-sixth Congress and culminating with Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. We have been talking for years about a stock pile of strategic materials, yet we still do not have a stock pile of tin and the officials operating under the War Powers Act are authorizing the export of tin plate. In my opinion, you cannot end their duties any too soon if that is the way they are going to fail to protect our national defense.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute, and may I say that I agree entirely with him. All of us will watch this matter of allocations and we will watch the matter of sending much-needed materials out of this country when we need them ourselves.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman very much. I am seriously concerned about this conservation of our strategic materials. We are literally flat on our back, yet they are exporting tin. I cannot imagine exporting a pound of it. I feel that such exportation is a menace to our national safety, and the officials administering the war powers have overlooked the matter of protecting our Nation's security against war itself. Their record has not been such as to convince me that their authority should be extended longer than provided in this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The reason they are exporting tin is that they can get a bigger price per ton for the tin exported than they can get in their own country. The gentleman will find that is the situation in relation to the exportation of tin if he will look behind the curtain.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I am going to look behind the curtain on the matter

of tin and other strategic materials, and I commend the Committee on the Judiciary, and especially the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], for their good work on this legislation to end the war powers at an early date.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire may extend their remarks in the RECORD just before the vote was taken on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2849), making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2849, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I heartily approve the economies effected by this bill. They are in keeping with and in continuation of, the program of economy which we followed in the last Congress in which we reduced practically every estimate submitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

Of course, when the war ended many governmental agencies had to be discontinued. They could not be dispensed with the day hostilities ceased. We had been 5 years developing them. They comprised widely distributed organizations, controlled billions of dollars worth of assets, employed hundreds of thousands and could not be concluded overnight. They had to be liquidated, and sometimes the cost of liquidation, for the time being, was more expensive than their continuation and maintenance would have been.

But just as rapidly as we reached the point where they could be eliminated, we curtailed their activities, reduced their appropriations, and prepared as expedi-

tiously as possible for final and complete liquidation.

Most of such agencies have now reached that stage, and the program of retrenchment and liquidation which we are following here is precisely the program initiated in the last Congress.

But it does not follow, necessarily, that a cut in appropriations, a reduction in estimates, is either a saving or an economy. In fact, there are conditions when decreased spending may ultimately involve additional expenditures.

Unfortunately, there are some instances of that character in this bill, instances in which apparent retrenchments eventually would result, not merely in failure to economize, but in some cases in an all-over increase in actual expenses of operation and liquidation.

While most of the estimates incorporated in this bill were largely matters of routine, merely deficiencies which must be taken care of at the end of the fiscal year, there were some interesting high lights both in the hearings and the bill itself.

Undoubtedly the most notable witness who appeared before the committee was President Hoover, who came before us on the item in which an appropriation of \$300,000,000 was recommended for government and relief in occupied areas. I do not think I have been more impressed with the demeanor of a witness and with the knowledge of detail and comprehension of the issues involved exhibited by President Hoover. He was wholly impartial. He confined himself entirely to the merits of the proposition before the committee, and made one of the most effective presentations I think I have ever heard. I was particularly impressed not only with his convincing and conclusive statement in support of the appropriation of \$300,000,000, and supplementary appropriations when they should become necessary, but also with his warm approval, and his unequivocal endorsement of the efficiency with which the funds for this purpose have been administered, and are now being administered, in the foreign countries which he visited.

There have been charges of waste, maladministration, and unwarranted diversion in the recent distribution of supplies and disbursements from this fund. President Hoover reiterated his approval of the handling of these supplies and funds and said that after a personal inspection he did not believe they could be better administered under the circumstances. I commend to all who may be interested in the efficient distribution of American supplies in these famine-stricken areas, the careful reading of ex-President Hoover's very illuminating testimony before the committee as reported in these hearings.

In that connection may I also express my appreciation of the endorsement by the chairman, the able and distinguished gentleman from New York, of the wise and effective administration of our international affairs by the Department of State. As he well said, we must make it plain to Stalin, and I might add, to all other European and Asiatic heads of

state, that we insist on free elections in Poland and elsewhere and that we will resist further encroachment on Greece and Turkey and that we demand that the agreements heretofore entered into by them be adhered to meticulously.

America is the traditional friend of Poland and the Polish people. More than any other one man, ex-President Wilson was the determining factor in the rehabilitation and reestablishment of Poland following the First World War. And every American President since, including President Truman has championed a free people under a free government in a free Poland. President Truman, this month, in one of the most momentous pronouncements ever made in American history promulgating the "Truman Doctrine," announced to Stalin and the world our determination to support threatened nations against encroachment or infiltration of communism, either abroad or in our own country. I am glad to join with the chairman in approval of that policy.

President Hoover warmly endorsed the provision of American funds to be used in providing food for European children. He spoke especially of the permanent handicap, both physical and mental, resulting from a subnormal diet in childhood. And the Committee on Appropriations unanimously approved his recommendation and his concern for European childhood by recommending in this bill the appropriation of every dollar requested for the purpose.

President Hoover's diagnosis of the deleterious effects of a defective diet in adolescent years is amply corroborated by the Army reports on the large percentage of American youth who were found to be disqualified for Army service by disabilities resulting from deficient diet in childhood. While we are providing for a normal and healthy generation of European people through adequate diet would it be amiss if we at the same time and in the same bill provided for normal and healthy American men and women in the next generation? While we are voting food for European children why cannot we vote food for American children?

It is difficult to believe that this committee and this House would vote for food for the children of other lands and neglect to vote food for our own children. But that is the proposition before us in this bill. Although schools in every State in the Nation are closing their school-lunch programs this month due to failure of the Congress to provide a deficiency appropriation to sustain the program, there is no provision in this bill for the continuation of school lunches. There is a provision here of \$300,000,000 for food for foreign children but none for American children. It is true that no estimate has been received for the item—due to the hostility against the program announced on this floor. But in view of the earnest representations made to us individually and collectively from every part of the country of the importance of continuing this program, a program which we led the American people to believe we expected to continue, it is much to be regretted

that this bill does not contain an appropriation of at least \$15,000,000 to take care of the deficit in the school-lunch program.

I am certain the Members of the House have been appalled by the numerous instances in which it has been testified children come to school without breakfast, even those children who come from wealthy homes where through caprice the child has not eaten breakfast. There is an unbroken record of testimony to the effect that in every school in which this program has been followed—and it is now being extended to practically every part of the country—there has been an immediate improvement in physical health and mental alertness. Hungry children are handicapped in scholarship as well as in normal physical development.

I trust the House will be willing to add a small sum for continuation of the school-lunch program for the remainder of the fiscal year. To fail to provide for it in this bill—late as it is in the school year—will to that extent estop us from consideration of such a provision in the annual supply bill coming up next month.

Another very interesting witness who appeared before us was General Bradley. General Bradley was one of our outstanding commanders in the war, a man with an unsurpassed military record. He contributed in his particular field, as largely perhaps as any other one man to the winning of the war. His administration of the Veterans' Administration has been remarkably efficient in spite of many obstacles.

Of course, it is inevitable that the executive head of this vast agency should find himself the object of criticism from many quarters. It would be impossible to administer it to the satisfaction of everybody. There is criticism by some part of the membership of the Congress that he has spent too much. There is criticism on the part of some of the beneficiaries, on the other hand, that he has not spent enough. But no man could have steered a course so successfully between charges of waste and charges of neglected need; between the requirements which were urged on the one side and economies which were demanded on the other, as has General Bradley. Of course, all of us know General Bradley succeeded to this position very reluctantly. He did not want it. It was forced upon him. He finally took it with the understanding that he would hold it only 2 years. I was distressed to hear him say that so arduous have been the duties of the position and so great has been the pressure for unwarranted concessions, and so unfair the criticism, that he desires to be released at the first opportunity.

In this connection, I was impressed with an article that I read this morning by Marquis Childs, a commentator in one of the local papers. It was written in amusing vein. He said the situation had reached the point where no Government servant dared approach Congress these days except at the risk of his life, and that it was the prevailing custom to break a leg off the nearest committee table and beat the offender over the head

on the apparent theory that all government is an iniquitous evil. Of course, that was a jocular fantasy, but it illustrates an idea which has gotten abroad through the country, an unfortunate idea unjustified by the situation, that we do not treat witnesses who come before us with courtesy. I am glad to deny that and say that all we seek of witnesses who come before us are facts. It is not a personal matter. All we want to know is what they can tell us on the merits of the proposition being considered by the committee. It is to be regretted that so unfortunate an impression has been disseminated—even in jest.

But we have been entirely too rigid in our efforts to achieve reasonable economy in the writing of the provisions in this bill providing for the Veterans' Administration. Speaking generally, we should realize at the beginning that the Veterans Administration is a rapidly growing and expanding activity. We were told when the Second World War obligations were first provided for that the activities of the Veterans' Administration would not reach their peak until about 1975 or 1980; that from this time on until that far distant peak of activity every year there would be more cases entitled to hospitalization and that every year there would be requirements for larger pensions, allocations, and benefits to which veterans and their dependents are entitled under the law. So we cannot always judge absolutely with arithmetical certainty just what the needs are. Under the circumstances, with so vital an issue involved, we should always see that no veteran suffers unnecessarily and that his convalescence is not retarded and that everything is done for him that his situation requires. That is one thing on which I think we are all agreed. That is the minimum.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Insufficient provision has been made there to meet minimum requirements, in my opinion. There is the provision for school and training benefits, one of the most notable provisions of the GI bill. That is a responsibility which rests upon us with a seriousness that is equaled by few other responsibilities borne by the Congress and the Government. I do not think sufficient has been provided for it in this bill.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The training of veterans in agricultural lines has been very popular in the section of the State which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. CANNON. It is popular because it is justified both by the program and by its effect upon the country.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It is a wonderful program, and the veterans are eager and anxious to take advantage of it, but we find that funds are being curtailed to the point where these programs cannot be carried on any longer. Are we going to say here, under the slogan of economy, that we are not going to give these boys,

who want to learn agriculture, who want to take advantage of these programs, an opportunity to avail themselves of a law which this Congress has passed? Is that what we mean by denying this appropriation in this deficiency bill?

Mr. CANNON. Of course, the statement is made in the hearings that by arithmetical computation ample funds have been provided. But they do not comport with the testimony which we have from other authoritative sources. Those most familiar with the situation say it is insufficient.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I have letters from men who are trying to carry out this program, and they tell me that they do not have the teaching force, they do not have the equipment, they do not have the facilities for taking care of the great number of applications that are pouring in. In other words, those veterans want to take this training. They say they cannot give it to them because there are not adequate funds available. If we had an adequate appropriation in this deficiency bill, that work would go on. That is what they tell me. I want to ask the gentleman if that is true.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly we should make provision sufficient to take care of the situation, under any circumstances, no matter how rapidly it may expand, rather than to be caught with insufficient funds and any veteran fail to receive what he is entitled to have under the law.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. When I say "some veterans," it is a great group of veterans in my section that are being denied this training, and I want to say there is quite a bit of resentment on the part of those veterans who want to take this training and make a better contribution to our economy. Now, did you go into that? Did you have testimony from over the country showing the need for this program?

Mr. CANNON. We had testimony from the Department, and all the testimony from the Department was to the effect that they needed the entire estimate for the readjustment fund.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. On what ground was this opposed in this deficiency bill? I would like to know.

Mr. CANNON. Of course, there is a great demand on the part of the country and the Congress for economy, and the danger is, as the gentleman has indicated, that in our zeal for economy we pare the cheese so close as to interfere with the adequate administration of the Veterans' Bureau and its obligations to the veteran.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Would you say it is economy to shut off medicine for a sick man or some man who was trying to recuperate? Do you call that economy?

Mr. CANNON. There is the possibility that such deep cuts instead of proving to be economies may involve additional expense and, incidentally, delay provision for the beneficiaries. Veterans are entitled to benefits under the law. If there is not sufficient money here it must be provided through deficiency appropriations. If such deficien-

cles develop after the 1948 funds become available, advancement will be made from the 1948 funds and a deficiency bill will be brought in later. If the deficiency develops before the 1948 funds are available a deficiency bill will have to be put through immediately. In either event nothing will have been gained by cutting the estimate in this bill.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. One other observation, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I think the gentleman will recall here in this Congress during the days when these boys were giving their all for our country and for our defense that we said that these boys coming back were going to have whatever they needed, that we were not going to deny them anything. Is this the answer to these boys who come back asking for an opportunity to go to school and learn to be farmers?

Mr. CANNON. I trust the bill before it leaves the House, or at least before it is reported out of conference, will provide amply for the veterans and their dependents.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, who has proven herself an unfailing friend of the veteran. I trust she still maintains that attitude on this appropriation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman anticipate offering an amendment?

Mr. CANNON. I hope an amendment can be offered which will be agreeable to both sides of the House making certain that no veteran suffers.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding is that there is no decrease in the matter of salaries with the exception of the public-relations service. Is that true?

Mr. CANNON. That is true.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And the cuts for the pensions of \$200,000,000 and readjustment benefits \$350,000,000 were put in because it was thought they were not needed at this moment. Is not that true?

Mr. CANNON. As I explained, the mathematical computations of the committee seem to indicate provision of ample funds, but evidence before the committee was to the contrary.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I believe there would be no difficulty in getting an amendment correcting it if that be true.

Mr. CANNON. I trust we may have from the distinguished lady from Massachusetts the support which she has always contributed to all worthy veterans' legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that General Bradley has stated that he might get along with a million dollars less on binding and printing. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. We propose no change in that item.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand, but the gentleman knows that we must insist on the amount for

compensation, pensions, and readjustment allowances.

Mr. CANNON. There are of course numbers of items throughout the bill—not merely in this particular section of the bill—in which I approve the amount reported out by the committee. Only on those which seem unquestionably inadequate would I propose any change.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Five hundred and fifty million dollars, then, is the sum of the two items on pensions and readjustment allowances.

Mr. CANNON. I had in mind the readjustment allowances. For example, there is one provision under this item which should be increased and which should have general endorsement. That is the revolving fund from which a veteran can borrow money in an emergency or to tide him over some particular need. A veteran may come in and borrow \$100 from the fund. All of us realize that there are times when loans should be available in such emergencies. There is not a chance for the Government to lose a penny on this program because when we lend a veteran \$100 from the fund we take \$10 a month from the amounts due him from the Government until the fund is fully reimbursed. So far as I know, there have been no losses.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That has not been cut, I understand. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. The amount requested was not provided.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes. I think the gentleman might be interested in knowing that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has approved a bill with an authorization for a larger amount for a revolving fund. There are too many disabled veterans unable to get their loans.

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to hear that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They were not able to get a loan because of lack of funds.

Mr. CANNON. The gentlewoman always anticipates any legitimate need of the veterans.

There is another item which does not come directly under the Veterans' Bureau but which immediately concerns administration of the GI bill of rights. It has to do with the Bureau of Community Facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, every college and university in the country is closing its doors to further enrollment because it no longer has facilities to take care of the veterans coming in under the GI bill of rights for training and education. There is not a school in the country, so far as I know, that is not sadly in need of these facilities for carrying out the provisions of the bill having to do with the training and education of its ex-servicemen. It may be that we are paying an extraordinary price, but the emergency is also extraordinary. Unless these boys can be cared for this year, their hopes in many instances, if not in most instances, will be dashed because unless the boy starts now he will be so late as to lose the full benefit of the law.

There is another failure in the bill to provide required funds necessary to pay the accrued salaries of Messrs. Lovett, Wilson, and Dodd as required under a decision of the Supreme Court. No one was more critical of these three men than I was. I appointed a special committee under the chairmanship of the very able and distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] to investigate the charges against them and after a complete and exhaustive investigation the undisputed evidence was that these men should be dismissed, and as they were not dismissed, the Congress declined to appropriate salaries for their services. However, unfortunately for our conception of the situation, the Supreme Court decided that they were entitled to their salaries.

There have been countries in which the decision of the ballot and the opinions of the courts, if not acceptable, precipitated a revolution. When they did not win an election they resorted to arms. When they did not like the decision of the court, they resorted to violence. But not so here in America. Here in the United States we are a law-abiding people. If we lose an election, we go along with the majority. That is the glory of our form of government. If the Supreme Court decides against us, as unpalatable as it may be, we bow in obedience to the decision of the greatest court on earth.

Now, I do not think these men should have been continued in their positions. I do not think they are entitled to salaries, but I cannot countenance a revolution against a decision of the Supreme Court. To do so is to flout the Constitution—an attempt to undermine the very foundations of the Government itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

This decision is rendered all the more significant in view of the decision of the House to deny an appropriation for the Warren salary. The refusal is an attempt to legislate out of office an employee of the executive branch of the Government by the refusal of money. No one has asserted more frequently or more emphatically on this floor the right of the Committee on Appropriations to deny appropriations, any appropriation, the right of the committee to refuse to appropriate for any purpose under any circumstances, but there is an implied limitation upon that right in the Constitution itself. To permit such action in effect annuls the separation of powers which the framers of the Constitution deemed essential to the maintenance of our American freedom. The Constitution establishes three branches of the Government, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. Each has its appointed field, and neither shall encroach upon the prerogatives of the other. For us to legislate men out of office, if carried to its ultimate conclusion, could violate not only the decision of the Supreme Court; by denying salaries we could abolish the Supreme Court itself. If you can do that in a small office, an inconsequential position, you can do it in any office, not excepting

the office of the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that before this bill leaves the House, we will be able to modify it sufficiently to take care of those imperative needs, the restriction of which would involve not economy but in the end additional expense and loss to the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN VERMONT

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Public Service Commission of Vermont has rendered several distinct and valuable services to the farm population of Vermont during the past 2 years. Not only have electric rate reductions during that 2-year period far exceeded those of any comparable period in the history of the commission, but in its rural electrification survey and program for the electrification of rural Vermont it has been instrumental in bringing electricity to thousands of Vermont farms for the first time.

This study has received high praise from many. The worth of this program was assessed by ex-Gov. Mortimer Proctor in his retiring message in January when he said:

No more valuable service to the people of rural Vermont has ever been rendered by the public service commission than that to be found in this feature of its activities and the manner in which it has followed through with its program of rural electrification.

Moreover, in its publication, *Electricity on a Vermont 25-Cow Farm*, the Vermont commission made available to farm users of electricity in Vermont a charted course or blueprint which shows not only the relative cost of, but how the individual farmer can profit from, the planned use of what the commission describes as his most valuable, most economical, most profitable hired man, electricity.

The following statement by Fletcher Plumley, chairman of the Vermont Public Service Commission, describes the rural electrification study. It is followed by excerpts from the commission's report on the use of electricity on the farm:

A REPORT ON RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN VERMONT (By Fletcher Plumley, chairman, public service commission)

In 1945, a State-wide survey of rural electrification was completed by the Vermont Public Service Commission. The information gathered was the basis upon which the commission supplied the retail distributors of electricity in Vermont with a detailed and well-charted postwar rural line building program. Today only 2 years later, the private utilities, the municipalities and cooperatives, having taken full advantage of this material and having followed the suggestions made by us, over 90 percent of all Vermont farms have electricity available to them; when our survey started, on the other hand, less than 75 percent of all farms had electricity available. We consider this progress.

Mr. Chairman, the high lights of this survey follow:

In the first place, the field data was gathered by having an engineer of the public serv-

ice commission staff perambulate some 14,300 miles of Vermont highways and byways.

The then-existing electric lines with their approximate locations were plotted on individual town maps (scaled 2 inches to the mile). Each building outside of cities, villages or small settlements was given a number, the owner or tenant was identified and the building was classified either as a farm,¹ a farm tenement, a rural residence, a school, a summer home, or "other."

Our field data also showed whether the individual establishment was electrified and, if not, whether electricity was available to it. (Electricity was considered "available" if an existing line was within one-quarter of a mile of the buildings thereof.) Where the farm buildings were electrified, notation was so made; also indicated was the company, municipality or cooperative by whom service was being supplied. If not electrified, the logical source of electricity was noted.

Lines were thereupon drawn on the field maps as the field survey progressed, showing a possible location and source for new electric lines. The source of electric service was designated by a code number on a working data sheet for each building not electrified.

The basic data thereafter was compiled, analyzed, summarized and eventually shown in detail. (Biennial Report for 1945, pp. 32 to 45, inclusive.)

From this data and these maps it was possible for us then to show in detail, county by county and town by town:

1. The county or town.
2. The total number of farms therein.
3. The total number and percentage of farms electrified, those with electricity available, and those to which electricity was not available.
4. The total number and percentage of farms that we of the PSC believed should either have electric service or have it available.
5. The approximate miles of line that would be necessary for area coverage.
6. The total number of prospective users on these miles of line for each town, each county, and the State as a whole.

This is the first complete survey of this nature that has been made. It has already proved of inestimable value. We believe no such undertaking in Vermont has been done for less cost by so few with such beneficial results to so many. In the days of PWA, CWA, or whatever the short-lived Federal agency may have been called, many attempts were started for surveys with this objective in view. Several were begun in Vermont; they have reposed for many years somewhere in the graveyard of similar projects which died aborning—but which, with no concrete results attained, far exceeded the cost incurred by the PSC for this survey of ours, which has been of such great use and value.

Our data, when first compiled, disclosed that of the 21,872 farms in Vermont, some 14,970, or 68.8 percent, were electrified as of December 1944. In addition, 1,370 farms, or 6.3 percent of the total number of farms, were found to be located beside or within one-quarter of a mile of existing lines, the limit within which we considered electric service as being available when, as, and if the farmer might desire it.

On the basis of the complete data then assembled, our commission came to the conclusion that as soon as manpower and material restrictions imposed by the war were removed there should be prompt electrification of an additional 4,000 farms in the State.

¹ Our definition of a farm closely parallels the U. S. Census definition. Thus, considerable latitude is used. For our purposes, the complete electrification of rural Vermont was the goal; this meant and means availability of electricity to all establishments including those where even a small "farming operation" is being performed.

We then believed that we would then see 93 percent of Vermont farms either electrified or with electricity available. That was the goal we set in December 1944. Moreover, not only would 4,000 additional farms be served, but, at the same time, approximately 1,500 rural residences, summer homes, camps, and schools would have electric service made available to them. To do this, it was estimated, would require the construction of 1,762 miles of rural electric line, at a cost of over \$2,000,000, to those called upon to build the lines.

It should be emphasized at this point, perhaps, that the commission does not actually build a half-mile of line, allocate the money, or supervise its construction. This is all done by the electric systems, when and where they please. We of the commission can point the way, suggest what should be done, and urge that it should be done; from there on it is largely up to the individual utilities.

As far as we know, at this stage, few of the then existing 45 electric systems in Vermont either had definite postwar plans or had given such serious thought to rural electrification that a concise, constructive, or planned program of progress was projected.

We believed that if this picture we had drawn could be adequately presented to the utilities in the State, pointing out at the same time the benefits which would accrue to them and to the people of the State, they would be as anxious as we were to reach the objective set.

Representatives of each corporate and municipal electric system were thereupon asked to come to Montpelier in a group and, later, individually, to meet with us and to discuss the possible program we believed their utility could and should follow.

There had been prepared for each, not only the detail for their existing system and all probable extensions, total farms, and total prospective users but also the miles of line necessary for the construction of each individual extension in each town served by them and for their system as a whole. In other words, we had a detailed postwar rural electrification building program for each of them. This mass of data, mapped and analyzed, we placed in the hands of the utilities, the municipalities, the cooperatives, without charge to them and as a public service.

As a follow-up to these conferences and discussions, each utility was supplied with a form on which to report their plans to us, and, also, a suggested form to follow in reporting to us each extension as and when built and energized.

This latter form is still being used to report progress to us; it shows the town, the system, the individual farm owner's name, the PSC map number of his farm, the line mileage involved, the date energized, the classification or symbol change, if any (i. e., whether they would classify the property as a summer home, a rural residence, or what), and a freehand sketch showing the approximate location of the new line.

Our first summation period came in December of 1945, and even though a late start had been made in the spring of that year, we were able to report to the public that 422 miles of new electric line had been built and energized.

The second summation now shows that between January 1, 1945, and November 1, 1946, some 1,026 miles of new electric line were built and energized and that 385 additional miles under construction are expected to be energized by the end of December 1946. This results in a total of 1,411 miles in the last 2 years, 80 percent of the mileage we

² Secs. 6452, 6453, 6454, and 6455 of the public laws of Vermont outline the procedure to be followed before the PSC by one who desires electric service but has been denied an extension by those to whom he has applied.

proposed in January 1945. Also, these 1,411 miles of new line mean substantial investments in rural electrification have been made by the utilities concerned.

In 1945 we said some 4,000 additional farms should have electric service; we also said—and I quote from our last biennial report—"When this is done, we will see 93 percent of Vermont farms electrified or with electricity available."

Today electricity already is available to 90 percent of all the farms in Vermont—not 90 percent of the best farms in the State, but 90 percent of all establishments which by any stretch of an enthusiast's imagination might be called farms.

Furthermore, we of the commission now expect, with the utilities of the State cooperating to the extent they have during the past 2 years, that by the end of the 1947 construction season 96 percent or 97 percent of all Vermont farms will have electricity available to them.

Vermont's record in rural electrification progress during the past 2 years has been outstanding. Area coverage is not just something to talk about here in Vermont; it has become an actuality.

Mr. Chairman, the publication of the commission, to which reference was earlier made, entitled "Electricity on a 25-Cow Farm in Vermont," is a source of information which should be in the hands of all farmers served by electricity, so I include it as a further extension of my remarks:

ELECTRICITY ON A 25-COW FARM IN VERMONT (A publication of the Vermont Public Service Commission)

Electricity has now been made available to over 90 percent of Vermont farms. By the end of 1947 this percentage will have moved ever closer to complete coverage.

The Public Service Commission of Vermont is gratified to have played an important part in this undertaking so meaningful to Vermont and Vermonter.

We are aware, however, that in too many instances electricity-on-the-farm has been allowed to remain a sleeping giant whose strength has not been used even to partial advantage.

In this pamphlet, material is included which attempts to point the way: to suggest that this "sleeping giant" is your most valuable, most economical, most profitable "hired man" if you would but use him.

This past fall, the public service commission asked each utility in Vermont to furnish it with information concerning the monthly bills of and the electrical farm machinery used by three or four of its "top" farm customers. We found that there are farm operations in Vermont using as much as 34,000 kilowatt-hours per year, that there are many using over 10,000 kilowatt-hours per year, and that the uses to which electric power is being put are legion.

These uses as yet are above average, to be sure. It was to bring some average figures to public notice that we asked Ralph Bugbee, farm director for Central Vermont Public Service Corporation (the utility having the largest number of farm customers in Vermont), to submit to us, for use in our biennial report, the results of his study of electricity on the farm. The following letter was sent to us by Mr. Bugbee.

We believe this is a challenging, informative and suggestive study that should have attention and wide distribution. We hereby incorporate it in this separate pamphlet so that the information it contains may more readily become the subject of discussion and, perhaps, the basis for individual study and action.

FLETCHER PLUMLEY, *Chairman.*
CHARLES C. MORSE.
WM. F. SINCLAIR.

There is no purchased service available to the farmer which lends itself in so many ways to the efficiency of the farm and the farm home as does electricity. Electricity is also the only purchased service which has declined in price during these past years when everything else has been increasing.

An electric utility is a mass-production business on which there is a very small profit per unit. In such a business both the customer and the utility should benefit if both play their part. When the farmer increases his use of electricity, he increases the gross profit of the utility. The utility in turn passes back part of its increased earnings in reduced costs of electricity and makes investment in improved equipment and service from which the customer benefits. As proof that this policy is working, I wish to point out that in 11 years from 1935 through 1946 the average kilowatt-hour use per farm on the system of the Central Vermont Public Service Corporation has increased from an average of about 1,000 kilowatt-hours to over 2,300—230 percent. During this period the company has put into effect four rate reductions and has improved its plant and equipment to a marked degree. In addition to the four general rate reductions, the low rates of the company have been made available to about 2,900 customers acquired by the purchase of other electric companies. The average cost of a kilowatt-hour to the farmer served by this company is at least 30 percent less than it was 10 years ago.

We have heard it said that the farm-electric bill is steadily going up. It is, but the ratio between cost per unit and what the farmer gets for his total bill is interesting. For instance in this company a farmer who uses 100 kilowatt-hours per month pays an average of 4.38 cents per kilowatt-hour, if he uses 250 they cost him 3.03 cents, and if he increases his use to 500 they drop to 2.51 cents. Looking at it another way his total cost has increased two and eight-tenths times but for that increase he has received five times as much electricity.

The Central Vermont Public Service Corp. believes that it is not unreasonable to expect that within a few years the average farm on its system will be using at least 6,000 kilowatt-hours per year. To accomplish this the company has a farm department of five trained men to consult with its farm customers and give them sound advice upon electrical applications. When the farmer knows how to use electricity, he soon realizes it is profitable and applies it to more and more of his farm operations with benefit to both the farmer and the utility. The company too will presently be serving considerably more than 90 percent of all the possible customers in its territory. It will have over 3,000 miles of rural lines or enough to reach from New York to San Francisco.

In support of our very real belief that liberal electrical installations on the farm are economically sound and financially profitable, the following statistics are presented for an average dairy farm of 25 cows and a small flock of hens. Figures of this type can always be questioned but there are on file many actual case histories, lists of equipment, and check meter tests which are even more convincing.

It is true that a reasonably complete list of electrical equipment for the farm and the home represents considerable money, but this cost compares favorably with other items of equipment that cost nearly as much for one item alone and whose use is limited to a very small part of the year. Electrical equipment is unquestionably more free from operation troubles and has a much longer productive life.

With the trend of labor away from the farm, a probable reduction in the financial return from farm products, and with an increase in the cost of all services—except electric—which farmers have to buy, there is a

tremendous opportunity for Vermont utilities to render a real service to the State by making electricity available to all areas and especially by showing their customers, both farm or urban, how to make the very best use of it.

Yearly average current consumption of electrical equipment and equipment depreciation on an average Vermont 25-cow dairy farm with a poultry flock of 500 hens

	Kilowatt-hours per year	Equipment cost (dollars)	Life (years)	Deprecia- tion	
				Percent	Dollars
FARM USE					
Lights.....	240	50	20	5	2.50
Milking machine (2 kilo- watt-hours per cow per month).....	600	250	10	10	25.00
Milk cooler (25 kilowatt- hours per can per month for 7 months cooling both night and morning, average 6 cans per day).....	1,050	330	10	10	33.00
Dairy water heater (8 gal- lons twice a day).....	1,800	65	10	10	6.50
Barn ventilator (check meter tests 7 months).....	630	150	10	10	15.00
Clippers.....	25	22	10	10	2.20
Small utility motor, 1/4 horsepower, to do the following work: Concrete mixer, separator, churn, emery wheel, grindstone, drill press, portable ele- vator, ice-cream freezer, lathe, sprayer.....	60	20	20	5	1.00
Large power motor, 5 to 7 1/2 horsepower, to do the following work: Wood saw, bench saw, feed grinder, silo filling, hay hoist.....	600	200	20	5	10.00
Silo cable (2-sash hotbed, 75 kilowatt-hours per sash per season of 2 months).....	300	15	10	10	1.50
Water-pipe protection (120 feet of cable and control, operating one-fourth of time, 800 watts, 5 months).....	1,000	15	10	10	1.50
Radio (100 watts, 2 hours per day).....	73	25	5	20	5.00
Water pump (pump only) (25 gallons per day for 25 cows, 2 horses, 12 young stock, etc.; 1,000 gallons for 1 kilowatt-hour).....	360	125	20	5	6.25
Brooder (2 broods of 300 chicks, 1/4 kilowatt-hour per chick).....	300	35	10	10	3.50
Total for farm.....	7,038	1,302			112.95
HOME USE					
Lights (fixtures only).....	240	100.00	20	5	5.00
Washer (wringing type).....	48	100.00	20	5	5.00
Refrigerator (8-foot).....	360	175.00	10	10	17.50
Range (8,000 customers, average 100 kilowatt- hours per month, farmers use slightly more).....	1,500	150.00	20	5	7.50
Toaster (good one).....	48	17.50	10	10	1.75
Percolator.....	48	5.00	10	10	.50
Vacuum cleaner.....	12	50.00	20	5	2.50
Mixer beater.....	48	30.00	10	10	3.00
Radio (100 watts, 6 hours per day).....	219	50.00	5	20	10.00
Waffle iron.....	48	5.00	10	10	.50
Heating pad.....	12	4.00	5	20	.80
Flat iron.....	72	10.00	10	10	1.00
Ironer.....	144	100.00	10	10	10.00
Water pump (barn system supplies house, 25 gallons per person per day).....	6				
Total for home.....	2,568	796.50			65.05
Total kilowatt hours for both farm and home.....					9,606
Average kilowatt hours per month.....					800
Average monthly kilowatt-hour cost.....					\$18.58
Total kilowatt-hour cost for year.....					\$222.96
Total depreciation for year.....					178.00
Total cost for year.....					400.96

Now let us see if this yearly average expense of \$400.96 can be justified from an efficiency and economy point of view. Many small farmers say that electrical equipment, especially milkers, coolers, and water pumps

alone make it possible to eliminate one hired man. At present wage scales the cash-wage payment alone exclusive of the usual prerequisites is more than twice the yearly bill. Each farmer can best analyze his particular operation by making a study of what it would cost him to do by some other method the work electricity is doing for him taking into consideration not only the dollar cost of operation but the convenience, safety, and versatile nature of the service.

We believe the following figures are conservative:

Yearly savings made possible by use of certain electrical equipment

Lights, 7 months half hour per day at 50 cents per hour.....	\$52.50
Milker 12 months 1 hour per day at 50 cents per hour.....	182.50
Cocle, 7 months 1 hour per day at 50 cents per hour.....	182.50
Water heater 12 months one-quarter hour per day at 50 cents per hour....	45.62
Utility motor 12 months one-half hour per day at 50 cents per hour.....	52.50
Soil cable 5 months one-half hour per day at 50 cents per hour.....	18.75
Brooder 1 hour per day at 50 cents per hour.....	10.25
Water pump 12 months 1 hour per day at 50 cents per hour.....	182.50
Ventilator—saving in health of cattle, depreciation of building, saving in moldy hay, veterinarian, etc. Estimated at least.....	50.00
Power motor—saving in labor, time, gas, and oil, wear and tear on machinery at least.....	50.00
Home—put your own figure on the value of this service to your wife and family and to the better home you can have.....	(?)

Total savings..... 827.12

To effect this saving of \$827.12 per year, it costs \$400.90 for electric current and depreciation. This leaves \$426.16 as a return on the investment of \$2,098.50 in electrical equipment. This is better than 20 percent.

We have purposely omitted the investment in a wiring system because it is such a varying figure. Three hundred dollars should put in one of the best, and when properly done it is good for a lifetime. An adequate and properly installed wiring system is essential for proper and economical operation of equipment, and is without question the safest source of light, heat, and power.

In addition to the items of electrical equipment mentioned above which are commonly accepted today on the reasonably well-equipped farm, there are others that are rapidly coming into use and which will eliminate still further much of the hardest farm labor. Some of these are the barn-hay finisher, farm and home food freezers, barn cleaners, home water heaters, dishwashers, electrically controlled central heating systems, and many small items to take the drudgery out of life.

We repeat that the liberal use of electricity under the trained supervision of utility personnel and extension service can and will make farm life in Vermont even more attractive than it is today.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

PROPAGANDA AGAINST ECONOMY

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the bill carries appropriations aggregating more than \$2,400,000,000. It represents a reduction in budget estimates of more than \$628,000,000.

It is to be hoped that those who are determined to oppose all reductions in Federal expenditure will in this instance obtain the facts before resorting to unjustified discharge of personnel and indulging in false propaganda such as we have recently witnessed.

The well-known practice of applying cuts to personnel in the lower brackets, as distinguished from those in the upper brackets, and to activities which are obviously important and popular as distinguished from those which are unimportant or unessential is contrary to the national interest and must cease.

It is perfectly evident that an organized campaign is being conducted against every effort to bring economy into the Federal Government in spite of the clear mandate from the people last November.

Of course, the bureaucrats with vested interests in their jobs are opposed to economy. Of course, the New Dealers who cling to the philosophy of "spend and spend, tax and tax" are opposed to economy. Of course, the Communists and fellow travelers who would destroy free enterprise in this country are opposed to economy.

No doubt they will all work together by propaganda, or otherwise, to continue the spending policies of recent years which have brought this country face to face with the most menacing financial picture in its history.

The most flagrant example of the point of view of those sponsoring this organized propaganda campaign is afforded by their recent action in respect to the House appropriation for the customs service in the next fiscal year.

This service asked for an increase of \$6,500,000 over their appropriation for the present fiscal year. The House approved an increase of \$3,165,000 over their appropriation for the present fiscal year. Yet, because the full increase requested was not granted for the fiscal year 1948, the head of the customs service actually went so far as to send dismissal notices, effective immediately in the fiscal year 1947, to some two thousand border and port patrol agents while fantastic stories were circulated to the effect that our borders and ports were, as a result of congressional action, wide open to smugglers.

This is just an example of the propaganda campaign emanating from the administration by which those in the Congress who seek to carry out the will of the people are confronted at this time.

I am confident that the American people will ultimately recognize the sources of this campaign. I am confident that they will ultimately appraise the campaign at its proper value. I am confident that they will continue to insist on the elimination of all waste and extravagance in the Federal Government.

A topheavy bureaucracy does not help the veteran, the wage earner, the farmer, or the people generally. All waste and inefficiency in Government simply increases the bill that all must pay.

The problem of putting our financial house in order is the most important domestic problem in America today.

Failure to take the steps essential to this end can easily result in national calamity and untold suffering for all.

ANTIDEFICIENCY LAW

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in reference to the so-called anti-deficiency law.

I call attention to the fact that your committee has been confronted by repeated violations of the spirit, if not the letter of this law. There are in this deficiency bill some six or seven examples where in my judgment the spirit if not the letter of the law has been violated.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the RECORD the provisions of the law appearing in title 31 of the United States Code.

TITLE 31, UNITED STATES CODE

No executive department or other Government establishment of the United States shall expend, in any one fiscal year, any sum in excess of appropriations made by Congress for that fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract or other obligation for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriations unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law. Nor shall any department or any officer of the Government accept voluntary service for the Government or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property. All appropriations made for contingent expenses or other general purposes, except appropriations made in fulfillment of contract obligations expressly authorized by law, or for objects required or authorized by law without reference to the amounts annually appropriated therefor, shall, on or before the beginning of each fiscal year, be so apportioned by monthly or other allotments as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which said appropriations are made; and all such apportionments shall be adhered to and shall not be waived or modified except upon the happening of some extraordinary emergency or unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of making such apportionment, but this provision shall not apply to the contingent appropriations of the Senate or House of Representatives; and in case said apportionments are waived or modified as herein provided, the same shall be waived or modified in writing by the head of such executive department or other Government establishment having control of the expenditure, and the reasons therefor shall be fully set forth in each particular case and communicated to Congress in connection with estimates for any additional appropriations required on account thereof. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be summarily removed from office and may also be punished by a fine of not less than \$100 or by imprisonment for not less than one month. (R. S. 3679; March 3, 1905, ch. 1484, sec. 4, 33 Stat. 1257; February 27, 1906, ch. 510, sec. 3, 34 Stat. 48.)

We are all familiar with its provisions in a general way, I think. We know that it provides, among other things, that no department shall employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property.

We know also that it provides that all appropriations shall, on or before the

beginning of each fiscal year, be so apportioned by monthly or other allotments as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which said appropriations are made.

We know also that the penalty for violation of the act is summary removal from office together with fine or imprisonment.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, in spite of the provisions of this act, your committee has been confronted again and again by agency after agency, often with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, but without one word to the Congress, by the actual employment of additional personnel, compelling the Congress either to approve additional funds for the fiscal year in question or to discontinue essential activities.

This practice, Mr. Chairman, must be ended.

One example in this bill is perhaps sufficient. I refer to the Veterans' Administration.

In 1940 there were some 38,000 people on the rolls of the Veterans' Administration. When General Bradley took over in the summer of 1945 there were some 64,000 people on the rolls. A year ago when this House approved the 1947 appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, it was approved on the basis of 143,588 persons on the rolls. In February of this year, General Bradley came before our committee and told us that he had no less than 204,654 people on the rolls. As a matter of fact, after examination it turned out to be not 204,654, but 224,852 people, and that did not include various employees who are not carried on the regular pay roll, which brought the over-all figure up to about 232,000 persons on the rolls.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, we were confronted in February with an increase of 80,000 persons on the rolls of the Veterans' Administration at a probable annual cost of something like \$240,000,000 without one word having been said to the Congress prior to the employment of any one of them.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to pick out any one agency. We all appreciate the tremendous problem that General Bradley has had. We all want to see a 100 percent job done for all our veterans. As a matter of fact, your committee has allowed, with a minor exception, the entire request for personnel for the balance of the year, subject to reconsideration in connection with 1948 funds.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, if the Congress is to exercise control over appropriations, it is manifest that the anti-deficiency law must be complied with.

Regardless of the merits or demerits, in this particular instance, of the increase in personnel, it is clear that a 60 percent increase in personnel without one word to the Congress cannot be justified.

REDUCTIONS IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION REQUESTS

Now, as far as appropriations for the Veterans' Administration are concerned,

we have already made available \$6,356,000,000. In this bill a further appropriation to the extent of \$2,003,000,000 was requested.

I may say that that request has been allowed in full except for two substantial reductions, the result of recalculation on the basis of recent rates of spending, largely concurred in by General Bradley; and two or three minor items of reduction, including a reduction in the number of those engaged in public relations work.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Am I correct in understanding that this money is not given now for the pensions and readjustments, but will be given in a later bill? In other words, it is just a matter of bookkeeping whether you do it now or later, because if the money is due the veterans by law, of course we will pay them.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Of course, when pensions are due, they will be paid in full. Of course, when readjustment allowances are due, they will be paid in full. The reductions here have been made because on the basis of the figures presented by the Veterans' Administration, more money was asked for than is required at this time.

For example, take the matter of pensions. The figures furnished your committee show that in the first 7 months of the year about \$1,068,000,000 was actually expended. The rate of expenditure in December was \$168,000,000; in January \$171,000,000.

Your committee allowed \$180,000,000 for each of the last 5 months of the year, and, in addition, a sum of \$172,000,000, which was expended in the fiscal year 1946.

Adding those three figures together gives a total of about \$2,140,000,000 needed as compared with about \$2,346,000,000 requested, giving an indicated cut of \$200,000,000, in which General Bradley appears to concur, as the lady from Massachusetts will note if she will refer to page 631 of the hearings before the committee.

Now let us look for a moment at the figures furnished in reference to readjustment allowances. This item breaks down into three subdivisions.

First, there is the request for loan-guarantee work, which General Bradley and the Bureau of the Budget indicated could be reduced by \$27,900,000. Your committee followed this recommendation.

Second, there is the request for education and training; and, third, the request for readjustment allowances.

For the first 7 months the Veterans' Administration figures indicate that there was spent for education and training \$1,272,000,000, an average of \$181,000,000 a month. Your committee allowed \$200,000,000 for each of the last 5 months, or a total of \$1,000,000,000. Adding that to the amount spent in the first 7 months gives a total of \$2,272,000,000 needed as compared with \$2,441,000,000 asked, indicating a possible reduction of \$170,000,000 in respect to education and training.

Figures furnished by the Veterans' Administration for readjustment allowances indicate that \$995,000,000 was spent in the first 7 months. Adding \$550,000,000 to that figure which allows \$110,000,000 for each of the last 5 months, an amount well in excess of the January expenditure, gives a total of \$1,505,000,000 needed as against \$1,850,000,000 requested, indicating a possible cut of \$345,000,000, in which General Bradley appears to concur, as the lady from Massachusetts will see by referring to page 638 of the committee hearings.

As a matter of fact, the committee did not cut the combined item the indicated \$515,000,000—\$170,000,000 plus \$345,000,000. It reduced the combined figure by \$350,000,000, leaving what appears to be a cushion of \$165,000,000 over and above that which is required.

I repeat that with the exception of these two reductions made on the basis of Veterans' Administration figures indicating that the money requested is not needed at this time, and two or three other minor reductions the Veterans' Administration has been allowed every cent that it has requested.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield again briefly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman feel that General Bradley made an error in asking for the amount? It would seem so because he apparently agrees that it is not needed. I am very much troubled about it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. From the figures presented by the Veterans' Administration it appears that someone overestimated present needs. The committee has made reductions to offset that overestimate on the basis of the Veterans' Administration's own figures.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And it is satisfactory to the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have referred the lady from Massachusetts to two citations in the committee hearings which seem to indicate that General Bradley is largely in accord with the reductions.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take too much time, and I shall condense as much as I can the remainder of what I intended to say.

RELIEF IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES

The chairman has referred to the item for relief in occupied areas amounting to \$300,000,000 on top of the \$425,000,000 already appropriated.

The reasons given for the supplemental request are: First, increase in food costs; second, displaced persons to the number of 620,000 in Germany and Austria; third, the taking over of the Ryukyu Islands from the Navy; fourth, the termination of UNRRA work in Austria on December 31, last; and fifth, an extra appropriation for Korea for economic rehabilitation.

The general objective is the increase in the calories per day to be made available in these countries, help to be provided until these countries are on a self-sufficient basis.

Supplemental estimate, fiscal year 1947, Government relief in occupied areas

[By project and area]

Subject No.	Purpose of project	Austria, United States zone, cost	Germany, United States zone, cost	Japan, cost	Korea, United States zone, cost	Italy, cost	Total
110	Purchase of grain, food, and kindred products.....	\$13,662,157	\$46,607,013	\$111,975,563	\$41,074,000		\$213,319,433
130	Purchase of petroleum and petroleum products.....	960,050	4,173,350	8,823,765	2,291,566	\$50,224	16,298,955
140	Purchase of textiles.....	1,097,534	3,953,715				5,051,249
160	Purchase of other supplies and equipment.....	718,781	4,695,711		10,000,000		15,414,500
421	Commercial ocean transportation.....	2,117,445	6,982,512	18,780,169	13,727,486	24,273	41,632,685
423	Transportation of civilian supplies (rail).....		1,465,538	4,616,551	1,550,789		7,633,178
430	Incidental operating expenses.....			650,000			650,000
	Total.....	18,556,675	67,878,139	144,846,843	68,643,841	74,497	300,000,000

You will notice that about \$67,000,000 is to go to Germany, \$18,000,000 to Austria, \$144,000,000 to Japan, \$68,000,000 to Korea, and a small amount to Italy.

If we add the sums already provided for these countries under the \$425,000,000 appropriation we shall find that Germany will receive, all told, about \$216,000,000, Austria \$22,000,000, Italy \$16,000,000, Japan \$330,000,000, and Korea \$138,000,000.

I call attention to the fact that the amount involved for ocean transportation is extremely high. It amounts to almost \$15 a metric ton.

Former President Hoover has suggested that perhaps \$90,000,000 might be saved in the next fiscal year if some of our Liberty ships were used for carrying the relief commodities.

As the chairman has pointed out, it appears that a reduction of \$38,000,000 might be made in this over-all item. The committee has preferred, however, to make the whole amount available on the understanding that the pipe line will carry on until September or October on that basis, and afford the committee a further opportunity for detailed consideration of the request for 1948 in connection with the War Department appropriation bill.

FOREIGN FINANCING SINCE WAR

Mr. Chairman, for my part I think it is manifest that much of the financing in other countries that we are being called upon to do, is essential if from no other point of view than that of national self-interest.

The difficulty that I find in the matter is the difficulty of knowing where to draw the line.

I think that difficulty has been tremendously increased by the fact that the administration has never put all the cards on the table nor given the Congress a complete, over-all program. It has been fed to us piece by piece and it has been our problem to try to put the picture puzzle together.

I have tried in this instance to obtain something of an over-all picture as to the period since the ending of the war. You will find the results of that attempt in-

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert at this point in the RECORD a table giving a break-down of the requested \$300,000,000, first by country and second by commodity:

cluded on pages 897 to 910 of the committee hearings.

Briefly, the information furnished seems to indicate that since the ending of the war in one form or another we have made available over \$14,000,000,000 and that we have given further authorizations of over \$7,000,000,000 or a grand total of over \$21,000,000,000.

Under leave to extend my remarks I insert at this point in the RECORD a brief table which summarizes the information that Assistant Secretary Clayton furnished the committee in this connection:

UNO and certain other international organizations.....	\$29,289,349
International Bank (total obligations, \$3,175,000,000).....	635,000,000
International fund.....	2,750,000,000
UNRRA.....	2,700,000,000
Occupied territories.....	802,034,187
Liberation territories.....	969,892,106
Lend-lease credits (since VJ-day).....	1,402,000,000
Lend-lease aid post VJ-day (China and Italy).....	761,000,000
Surplus property credits.....	1,148,000,000
Loan to United Kingdom (total obligations, \$3,750,000,000).....	600,000,000
Grants to Philippine Islands (\$20,000,000 loans also authorized).....	620,000,000
Export-Import Banks (loans disbursed).....	1,592,207,176
Total.....	14,009,422,818
Further authorizations:	
International Bank.....	2,540,000,000
Loan to United Kingdom.....	3,150,000,000
Loan to the Philippine Islands.....	20,000,000
Export-Import Bank.....	1,339,000,000
Total.....	21,058,422,818

May I point out in closing that it appears from the RECORD that approximately \$3,700,000,000 have been made available for UNRRA and of that Uncle Sam has contributed about \$2,700,000,000.

There is available for expenditure in the calendar year 1947 some \$600,000,000 and of this same \$305,000,000 contributed by this country is planned for expenditure after the 1st of July next—in other words, in the fiscal year 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, included in this \$600,000,000 for distribution in the calendar year 1947 is over \$243,000,000 for China, over \$34,000,000 for Austria, over \$21,000,000 for Greece and over \$194,000,000 for seven Russian satellite countries.

I mention this in closing Mr. Chairman because it seems to me that unless General Marshall is able to obtain results at Moscow a very definite question presents itself as to whether these supplies should be allowed to go forward to the satellite countries to which I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, in the report of the Committee on Appropriations on this bill, you will notice on page 11, at the bottom of the page, these words:

JUDGMENTS

House Document 131, submitting a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, included judgments in favor of Goodwin B. Watson, \$101.78; William E. Dodd, Jr., \$59.83; and Robert Morris Lovett, \$1,996.40. These judgments resulted from action in the courts to recover compensation for periods of service after November 15, 1943, the effective date of an act of Congress forbidding the employment of such persons unless appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The committee has denied the requested appropriation to pay the judgments.

The decision of the Court of Claims, speaking through the Chief Justice, concludes with these words:

In view of the conclusions arrived at it is immaterial whether section 304 of the Urgency Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943 or any part thereof is unconstitutional or not. We do not decide that question. The plaintiffs are entitled to recover in either event.

Then it goes on to say that Robert Morris Lovett is entitled to recover \$1,996.40, the same amount certified by the Budget, the Treasury, and the President; Goodwin B. Watson is entitled to recover \$101.78; and William E. Dodd, Jr., is entitled to recover \$59.83.

The judgments will be entered accordingly. It is so ordered.

That is the conclusion of the Court of Claims. The Supreme Court decision concludes as follows:

When our Constitution and Bill of Rights were written, our ancestors had ample reason to know that legislative trials and punishments were too dangerous to liberty to exist in a nation of freemen they envisioned, and so they proscribed bills of attainder. Section 304 is one. Much as we regret to declare an act of Congress violates the Constitution, we have no alternative here.

Section 304, therefore, does not stand as an obstacle to payment of compensation to Lovett, Watson, and Dodd. The judgment in their favor is affirmed.

I have no desire to quarrel with anyone who disagrees with the position I feel compelled to take in this matter, but I have always had the belief, yea, more than the belief, the conviction, that the purpose of the Appropriations Committee, its chief function, was to implement the will of Congress and to perform the duty lawfully assigned to it by Congress as interpreted by the courts. When, therefore, Congress enacts a piece of legislation and the Supreme Court affirms judgments of the Court of Claims to the effect that whether that enactment is constitutional or not, the money decreed by those judgments must be paid. I maintain no Member, nor committee, nor body of Congress has any right to defy the law so declared. Especially is that true in the Lovett, Dodd, and Watson cases, wherein the Supreme Court not only affirmed the judgments of the court of claims, but also went further and declared that the enactment by Congress which sought to prevent payment of their salaries was a bill of attainder, and hence utterly null and void because unconstitutional. So, in those cases it is too clear for doubt that it is the manifest duty of all who would observe the law of the land to bow to that mandate.

Unless, then, we hold ourselves above the law, we must provide the funds needed to satisfy these judgments.

I am not here to try to lecture anybody. I am not here blaming anybody. I am simply rising for a point of information which I desire fervently. I listened to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee in his statement today that he could not conscientiously vote to pay these judgments. I honor him as I do few men in this House for his integrity and for his high character in every respect, but I submit that his statement does not satisfy me as an answer, and I would love to ask the gentleman to point out what he relies on to justify his position.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it has been the practice of this Congress in the past when unconscionable judgments were rendered by courts to refuse to pay them. There are precedents of that character. This is an unconscionable judgment. These three men beyond dispute did not owe their first loyalty to the Government of the United States. When the Court refused to pay attention to the law which the Congress wrote, and when it by virtue of an assumed power attempted to declare that provision of law unconstitutional, I felt that the operation had such an odor that I could not conscientiously be a party to bringing in an appropriation to meet it. Under the Constitution, the direct power to make appropriations, whether to satisfy judgments or otherwise, is exclusively in the Congress, and I feel that we have that responsibility.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman for amplifying his answer and I appreciate his answer. Of course, I agree with the gentleman that the power to appropriate is not only in Congress but particularly in this House, and, more especially, in the great committee of which the gentleman happens to be the honored and able chairman at this time,

But his answer amounts to nothing more than that he so violently disagrees with the courts that he has decided against his contention he will do what he pleases, without regard to the law as declared by the authorities to which that duty has been committed, and seeks to excuse his conduct because it has been done before.

Of course, the legislative branch of our Government has the power of the purse. But that great power, as every other power in a government of law, not of men, may only be exercised within the law and in accord with the law.

Does not your theory lead to the destruction of our form of government, which the Constitution prescribes should be administered by three coordinate branches, free and independent of each other?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Goff].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I think there are many among my colleagues of the House who have seen a far-stretching graveyard of a great forest, and who have realized the terrible loss to mankind. Irreplaceable destruction has been caused by forest fires. But today we have in the Pacific Northwest another, and not less potent, killer of trees—the tussock moth. This insect has ravaged thousands of acres of valuable timber in the primitive and beautiful mountains of northern Idaho.

Just east of the heavily wheat and pea productive Palouse farming section, stretching across from eastern Washington, I take you to the edge of the immense evergreen forests of the Idaho Panhandle. Here in this border area, between farm and forest, during the summer of 1945, it was noticed that some destructive agent was attacking scattered areas of fir trees. Then it was recalled that in 1944 a few trees had turned brown and died. There was no pronounced public uneasiness, although a few owners sprayed or cut down and burned dying farmhouse shade trees. But in the summer of 1946, the damage quickly spread to an alarming extent. Whole hillsides of heavy timber now turned yellow as though touched by a searing blast, and great patches appeared in State and Federal forests, reaching out into stands of merchantable timber. Public meetings were held. Experts from the Forest Insect Division of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine and the Forest Service men assigned to the region, who had been checking on the outbreak, reported that the Douglas fir tussock moth was responsible for the damage.

The Tussock moth is a small insect which basically attacks Douglas fir and white fir, but feeds on other tree species associated with firs when food is scarce. The injury is done by the larva of the moth. The young caterpillars hatch in late May and feed on the foliage, killing the tree by defoliation. They are active and travel in search of food and the infestation is most widely spread by these tiny, newly hatched caterpillars. These are covered with hairs, spin little silken threads after coming out of the egg, and are blown by the wind to other trees for considerable distances. While

the rate of increase is tremendous, there is fortunately but a single generation each year, and the damage is done only in the period of about 30 days before the caterpillar changes to a moth.

About 350,000 acres are now covered by the infestation in Latah, Benewah, and Clearwater counties. This includes Federal, State, county, and privately owned land. With the wartime development of new insecticides, particularly DDT, and the fact that small quantities are effective, spraying can be done by airplanes. Such a program has been tried out successfully on a much smaller scale against the gypsy moth in New York and Pennsylvania. Obviously, the aerial spraying must cover the whole area, and there is no way to stop it exactly along the boundary of the various owners. It is peculiarly a project for cooperative effort. The legislature of Idaho this last month appropriated \$210,000 for its share of the work. The private timber owners, including lumber companies, who form the Potlatch Timber Protective Association, have voted to assess themselves \$68,000 for their share. Private owners of small forest plots have agreed to put up 42½ cents per acre for the aerial spraying.

The Federal Government is particularly concerned in stamping out the infestation because the untouched area to the east, and in the path of the prevailing winds is heavily timbered national forest. There is an immediate prospect of the loss of millions of dollars of lumber values. This lumber cannot be spared at any time, and certainly not now, in the face of our acute building shortage.

But the commercial timber is only a part of the loss. Large areas of dead trees mean a greatly increased fire hazard. Farm woodlots of smaller private owners will continue to die if the center of infestation is not cleaned out. As grave as all else is the threat to our watersheds and, not the least, the destruction of the scenic beauty of one of the loveliest parts of the primitive forests of Idaho.

That is why I urged upon the committee, and now urge upon you the necessity for this item in the deficiency bill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price].

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts referred to this bill as an economy move. I will say to the gentleman, on the record the bill hardly stands up as an economy measure. Of the \$628,139,491 the committee has cut from the budget estimate, \$551,020,000 is being taken from the Veterans' Administration—and that is the part of this bill I want to talk about now.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the action taken by the committee in reducing the current deficiency appropriation of the Veterans' Administration is sheer folly. This action does not contribute to economy. Rather, the action taken by the committee contributes only to the growing confusion facing our administrative agencies as a result of bungling of appropriations.

Hearings on the current Veterans' Administration deficiency appropriations were held for the first time on February 13, of this year. It has taken since February 13 to get this measure to the floor. I point this out because, due to the committee's action—if it is upheld—it will be necessary to act on another deficiency appropriation for the Veterans' Administration before this session of Congress adjourns.

The bill as reported by the committee reduces pensions in the amount of \$200,000,000. It also reduces by \$350,000,000 funds with which to take care of direct benefits under the GI bill of rights. These are not savings. This action by the committee will merely make it necessary that another deficiency appropriation be considered at a later date.

This action cannot be a saving because the purpose for which the original budget estimate was requested is provided for under existing law—and under law the Government is committed to make these expenditures to our war veterans.

At the present rate that this bill is progressing, it cannot conceivably become law before April 10. Therefore, in order that the GI benefits and the pensions of our veterans be paid for the remainder of the fiscal year, it will be necessary for the Veterans' Administration to request another deficiency appropriation on April 15 in order to obtain action on its request before the adjournment of this session of Congress.

It seems to me ridiculous that we are taking this action. Certainly we are not saving money. Certainly, we are not saving the time and efforts of the committee nor of the House. In my estimation the only thing that is accomplished by this bill is that it will provide a false basis for claims of economy by the Republican Members of this House.

The money that is requested in the original budget submitted by the Veterans' Administration for these pensions and direct benefits must eventually be paid. In my opinion the House should promptly meet the full estimate for 1947 pensions and readjustment benefits in order that we may know exactly where we stand in matters affecting the national budget.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in deference to the contentions of the gentleman who have preceded me, I think I should call attention to certain testimony of the officials of the Veterans' Administration.

I hold in my hand the hearings on this bill. At page 638 of the testimony dealing with the readjustment benefits, the record reads as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. In January a little under \$90,000,000; with \$15,000,000 it would be \$105,000,000. If you call it \$110,000,000 you would be getting to pretty near a stable average, would you not? It ought not to run over \$110,000,000.

General BRADLEY. Under present conditions that ought to be all right.

The CHAIRMAN. On that basis \$550,000,000 ought to take care of the last 5 months, which would make about \$1,505,000,000 for the year. This was 7 months. The first 6

months was \$955,000,000. So that \$550,000,000 would cover your requirements for the way the thing looks now.

Mr. MOORE. That would be that one particular phase.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what I am asking you about?

General BRADLEY. We think that will. You see the figures I gave you a minute ago on which the estimates were based were made up last fall, and we anticipated about \$1,250,000 average and now we are getting only about \$1,150,000.

In other words, last fall, when they made up these estimates for the deficiency requests, they thought they would have about a million and a quarter veterans asking for readjustment allowances. It is running considerably less than that. General Bradley says we are now getting about \$1,150,000.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. There has been a decided increase in the number of veterans requesting this allowance in the past 2 months.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This was the statement of General Bradley before the committee, and we had him before the committee two or three times. The hearings from which I quoted are dated March 17.

I do understand there has been some confusion with respect to one item in their request, but that is a matter on which we expect to take additional testimony. We expect to get some further information on that.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Who would be better informed than the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Well, sir, no one should be better informed than the Veterans' Administration, and General Bradley said, "Last fall, we expected \$1,250,000. Now it is running \$1,150,000." He agreed that the total of the figure of what had been expended during the first 7 months, plus allowing \$110,000,000 for the last 5 months, made \$1,505,000,000. That compares with the request in the deficiency estimates of \$1,707,000,000.

You will also find in the hearings that General Bradley said that the amount required for Army and Navy pensions, on the basis of actual expenditures, would run about two hundred million below what they estimated last fall, when they prepared their deficiency estimates. I believe everyone agrees that reduction should stand.

No Member of the Congress wants to welch in any sense on any promise that has been made to the veterans. At the same time, when representatives of the Veterans' Administration come before us and tell us that things are not coming out quite the way they expected and they do not need as much money as they expected, the Congress would expect us to reduce the estimates accordingly.

There was another item for loans. I think in their estimates as they came up they indicated that a cut-back of \$27,000,000 should be made. Surely we are expected to report that item in the reduced amount.

Advance estimates can be off either way, up or down, when you are setting

up an activity as large as the Veterans' Administration. A year ago, when they came before the Committee on Independent Offices and asked for their money, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] knows, they estimated that 143,000 employees would do the job. But at the end of January this year they had about 220,000 employees. In other words, they just missed it by about 80,000, as to the number of employees they would have. General Bradley told us he was starting to whittle that down and he thought he could cut it down to 205,000 perhaps.

On the 1st of July 1945 the entire Veterans' Administration had eight employees assigned to public relations work. At the end of January this year they had 281 on the job of public relations. Let us not be confused between public relations and contact men. The public relations men are publicity men. You will probably hear from some of these publicity men about this cut because the Committee proposes to place a ceiling of 100 on the number of public relations or publicity people that the Veterans' Administration may have. Do not confuse those with contact representatives. The number of contact representatives the Veterans' Administration had at the end of January was approximately 6,900. So the ceiling on these publicity men will not interfere with contact representatives. There are something over 6,900 contact men still on the rolls.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If the Congress would pass a law to give permanent status, call it a pension, compensation, or what you please, for everyone who has been on the roll for 10 years—in other words, make his status a permanent situation, so that all they would have to do would be to issue the checks to him, in my opinion in that way they could cut down largely the employees of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is a very interesting suggestion.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, I will give the gentleman my reasons for that. In 1928 and 1929 we had about as many people drawing pensions, that is, Civil War, Spanish-American War, and peacetime men, as were drawing compensation from the Veterans' Bureau, yet the expense of the Pension Bureau was only about \$3,500,000 while the expense of the Veterans' Administration was about \$41,000,000 or \$42,000,000. It is true that a large portion of that, about \$19,000,000, I believe, was due to hospitalization; but even with that eliminated the difference was about eighteen to twenty million dollars. So if instead of having a large number of people to, as the saying goes, boll weevil through the records of these boys who have been on compensation for 5 or 6, or 8 or 10 years, they be put on permanently and their cases retired to the files, in my opinion, we could cut down the number of employees in the Veterans' Administration considerably.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The distinguished gentleman who served so long as chairman of the Committee on World

War Veterans' Legislation and now is the ranking minority member, I hope will pursue that matter further in the deliberations of his committee. Certainly it is important that the country be in a position to discharge its obligations to the veterans, and nobody knows better than the gentleman who has just interrogated me that the country does not want to see the time come when somebody comes along and proposes another economy act that will strike from the pension rolls a good many men who deserve to be kept there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will yield to the gentleman, but I hope he will not take all my 3 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly not.

I would be the last man in the House to want to balance the budget on the disabled soldiers. I fought the economy bill, because it cut a great many disabled soldiers too deeply; but I do say that there is room, if properly managed, to bring about some economy without at the same time injuring the cause of the veterans.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct; but if get we economy that will help to protect our ability to pay the men who should be provided for.

Now I wish to direct your attention for just a minute to an item which appears at the bottom of page 26 following the \$300,000,000 item for government and relief in occupied areas.

It is a new proviso which reads as follows:

That it is the sense of the Congress that the governments, military and otherwise, or nations receiving aid under the provisions of this act, shall be expected to provide, in agreements to be signed by their governments when established (if not already established) for reimbursement to the United States for such aid: *Provided further*, That not exceeding \$60,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this head shall be available for providing the necessary water transportation and transportation facilities including surplus ships which may be made available.

The first part of the proviso goes to the matter of the reimbursement of this country for the aid to be extended to occupied countries. Mr. Petersen, representing the Secretary of War, and others appearing before our committee told us it was anticipated that reimbursement would be received by crediting favorable export balances and, in addition, every effort would be made to obtain from the governments of the occupied countries such provision for future reimbursement as could be obtained. The committee thought that idea ought to have the approval of the Congress; so we provided that it is the sense of the Congress this reimbursement agreement should be sought.

The committee also felt something should be done about shipping costs. The testimony disclosed that of the money expended during the first 6 or 7 months of the year the shipping costs came to 28.6 percent of the total that was being expended for this food and relief. We

thought that was just too big a proportion to go for transportation. The request for \$300,000,000 contemplates \$64,000,000 for that purpose. In the limitation in the second proviso we say "not to exceed \$60,000,000," which will bring the cost down to not to exceed 20 percent rather than permitting it to go up to 28.6 percent.

In addition to that, we have provided that this \$60,000,000 may be available for providing water transportation and transportation facilities, including surplus ships. This looks ahead to the possibility of using some of the surplus Liberty ships manned by crews of the recipient countries in line with a suggestion made by former President Hoover.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, on page 24 of this bill there is given to the Treasury Department for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation the sum of \$20,000,000. This makes a total of \$90,000,000 that has been given to this organization.

I have today introduced a bill providing that the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation shall not enter into any insurance contracts to insure the protection of agricultural commodities against any loss in yield. In 1945 I fought those appropriations on the floor of the House. I had J. Carl Wright, Manager of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, before me in my office a number of times. We discussed this. I also discussed it with Marvin Jones, and came to the conclusion that this is one of the biggest rat holes in the country for the expenditure of money and that this Corporation should be disbanded at once.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. This provision was put in the bill after considerable deliberation on the part of the committee, especially by the chairman and myself. In fact, the provision was inserted in the bill at my request. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania will agree that while the possibilities of working out a practical insurance program for the future is a matter of debate, yet outstanding claims which have already matured should be honored?

Mr. RICH. Yes; and if the gentleman had followed me in 1945 when we tried to eliminate this, we would have saved this country from \$75,000,000 to \$100,000,000. The country would have been better off, the farmers and everybody else would have been better off. It is a Corporation that ought to be dispensed with and the quicker that is done the better for the country.

Federal crop insurance was first authorized by Congress in 1938 and has been a losing proposition from that day to this.

The Corporation was granted an authorized capital of \$100,000,000. Seventy million of this capital has been issued and all lost except about \$14,-

000,000. More than 2 years ago I discovered this Corporation was a constant sink-hole for not only the money appropriated for running expenses by Congress, but also for the \$70,000,000 capital stock issued. Having opposed the legislation on the floor of the House, I felt that no legitimate business could exist under such conditions or management, and therefore, on March 5, 1945, I sent a letter to the then manager, J. Carl Wright, in part as follows:

MARCH 5, 1945.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention of Mr. J. Carl Wright,
Manager.)

Now in order that I, as a Member of Congress, can expect—and I shall expect—a good business administration, not only of your Corporation but all Government corporations, I am asking for a report on the qualifications of yourself as well as the other members of your board of directors to handle insurance, and what experience you have had to qualify you for appointment to the position you occupy. Have you carried out the intent and purpose of the Congress in trying to conduct this Federal Crop Insurance Corporation on a basis that would be commensurate with sound business principles? Are your rates such for the year 1945 that, from your past experience, the insurance you put in force will pay the expenses of the operation of the Corporation; and if in normal years, would you break even, or have a balanced budget, or would you have losses? If so, how much would your losses be; or would there be a likelihood of a gain, and why?

You were given \$40,000,000 for this Corporation; and you lost, according to your reports, \$37,500,000 plus the seven million that you made on the increased price of grains. Today you only have left \$2,500,000, of the forty million that was given you to start operation. What recommendations have you made for changes in law, if any are necessary, to make your organization a successful insurance corporation?

Now I am not personally acquainted with you, or any of the other managers, and I do not wish to offend you. I am merely asking for a report that I can follow up to determine whether this Corporation is even trying to be successful, or whether there is a motive behind this to give hand-outs to the farmers in the guise of insurance. I believe it would be very wise for you to be absolutely frank and open and aboveboard in your reply, giving me all the facts. I am not inquiring of you anything that I would not inquire of any other corporation which I knew to be as unsuccessful as your Corporation has been since 1939.

For 19 days I waited for an answer to this letter, and on March 24, 1945, received a four-page letter, dated March 23, 1945.

In reference to my inquiry requesting a report on the qualifications and experience of the Manager and the Board of Directors who handle this insurance, I received the following quotation from said letter:

You have asked also for a report on the qualifications of myself and members of the Board of Directors. With regard to my own qualifications, I have been Manager only since September 1943. I would be pleased to come to your office at your convenience to answer this question in person.

The Board of Directors are men each of whom has been successful in his own field of work, and are as follows:

Mr. E. R. Duke, Chairman, Director of War Boards.

Mr. W. A. Jump, Director of Finance of the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration.

Mr. W. B. Boyd, Director of Price, War Food Administration.

The Board of Directors are appointed by the War Food Administrator. The Board appoints the Manager of the Corporation.

If there is other information you would desire as to myself or the operation of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, I would be pleased to furnish it or come to your office at your convenience and discuss the same with you.

Sincerely yours,

J. CARL WRIGHT,
Manager.

From the foregoing it was readily seen neither the manager nor any member of the Board knew anything about insurance. Two of the directors were appointed from the War Food Administration and the Chairman from a directorship of the war boards.

Their only qualifications from this letter showed that they had no experience in insurance and thus no qualifications whatsoever to manage this Corporation. They were simply transferred or appointed from one political agency of the Government to another, regardless of their competency to handle or even to understand either crop or any other kind of insurance business.

No corporation on earth engaged in private business would even consider men to run or manage its affairs without more experience and competency than these men had, according to this letter. They appear to be totally unfitted for the top positions they have occupied. It would be just as reasonable to have a blacksmith perform an appendicitis operation as to have such men run a crop-insurance corporation.

Because this letter was so unsatisfactory and lacking in information, I sent another letter to the Honorable Marvin Jones, then War Food Administrator, on the 24th day of March 1945, which, in part, read as follows:

MARCH 24, 1945.

HON. MARVIN JONES,
War Food Administrator,
Agriculture Administration Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am much concerned in some of the objectives of government. When the first deficiency appropriation bill, asking for an appropriation of \$30,000,000 additional for the Federal crop-insurance program came before the House, March 2, I opposed the item mainly on the point that the crop-insurance program had been in effect 5 years, and during that time the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation lost \$37,500,000 of the original \$40,000,000 appropriated and had invested \$7,000,000 in wheat and made a profit, which they lost also. I came to the conclusion that this was a mighty poorly organized and managed business under the law to lose such a great amount of their capital in such a short time.

Now, I understand that the War Food Administrator appoints the Board of Directors of this Corporation and they are composed of the following: Mr. E. R. Duke, Mr. W. A. Jump, and Mr. W. B. Boyd.

The Board in turn appoint the Manager. I would like to know from you, Marvin, what experience these men have had in insurance; what experience have they had in making rates; why is it that this Corporation has been

so very, very unsuccessful? Since it is your responsibility to appoint the Board of Directors, certainly you should look into the operation of this Corporation. I would like to know what are the qualifications of these Directors and the Manager, Mr. J. Carl Wright, that you entrust them with such a sum of money and it is dissipated in such a short time.

This just does not make sense to me as a businessman, Marvin. I am writing you this letter not with the idea of interfering with any successful organization, but of trying to help one that is not successful, and if the right men are not at the head, then it is up to you to change them. I know none of these men personally, but am going to keep my eye on this Corporation in the future for successful operation. If I can be of any assistance, you know you may command me.

This letter to the War Food Administrator was answered on the 7th day of April 1945, and is as follows:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, April 7, 1945.

HON. ROBERT F. RICH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RICH: I have your letter of March 24, which is in connection with the operations of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

I appreciate your interest in this matter and can well understand your concern regarding the financial position of the Corporation after 5 years' operations in insuring wheat and 2 years' in insuring cotton. The results have been disappointing to us, and we recognize that mistakes were made in the development and administration of the program. However, when the program was initiated there was no experience in this field upon which we could draw. Experience has now been acquired which should prove invaluable in future operations, and we hope to profit by this experience even though much of it is not on the credit side of the ledger.

Although indemnities exceeded premium collections by approximately \$37,500,000 during this period and the desirable objective of providing insurance without impairment of the capital stock of the Corporation was not realized, this amount as well as the premiums collected was paid to farmers who suffered crop losses from adverse weather and other hazards over which they had no control. Without this protection many of these farmers would have been forced into liquidation. From the standpoint of national welfare, it could, therefore, hardly be said that these funds represent a total loss.

When the amendment to the Crop Insurance Act became effective December 23, 1944, I immediately appointed a new board of directors of the Corporation. One of these men worked in the crop-insurance program for a number of years and was selected because of the constructive suggestions which he made for improvement in the program during that time and because I considered that his experience would be useful in avoiding errors in the future. The other two were selected because of their long experience in the administration of agricultural programs and because of their reputations for dependability and sound judgment. I am sure you will agree that the administration of an all-risk insurance program on crops involves thorough knowledge of farming methods, the nature of the crops insured, and the hazards which are encountered in producing various crops as well as certain insurance principles. It is an agricultural program which requires the application of sound insurance principles in its operations.

At the time the program was reinstated after the passage of the act of December 23, 1944, it was extremely difficult to obtain the services of able insurance executives although we recognized that it was necessary for the corporation to have available the best possible insurance counsel and advice. Ac-

cordingly, the board of directors, with my concurrence, has entered into a contract with Ekern & Meyers, a Chicago firm which has an outstanding reputation in this field, to assist the management in developing the program along sound insurance lines. The senior member of this firm served as chairman of a consulting committee which in 1941 and 1942 made an analysis of the operations of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. The committee published a report containing a number of specific recommendations for changes and most of the recommended changes have been incorporated in the present program. Mr. Ekern has been in Washington almost continuously during the past 2 months for the purpose of assisting the management in developing an insurance program on cotton, wheat, and flax on a Nation-wide basis, and for cotton and tobacco on an experimental basis.

In view of the late date on which the legislation was enacted, these programs had to be developed hurriedly in order to make them applicable to crops planted in 1945. We are endeavoring to do the very best job we can in the limited time available.

I have been most interested in having the crop-insurance program succeed and have personally met with the agricultural committees of both the House of Representatives and the Senate and sought their counsel and advice. I feel that the objectives of the program are so desirable that no work should be spared, and every possible avenue which might offer a sound approach should be explored in an effort directed toward successful operation.

I shall maintain an active interest in the program; and if changes appear to be necessary either in the personnel of the Corporation or in program provisions within the framework set up by the law, you may be assured that such changes will be made.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES,
Administrator.

This letter admits that premiums were exceeded by losses or indemnities by approximately \$37,500,000, and the 1945 crop was not included because it was not yet harvest time and losses could then neither be ascertained nor determined.

Furthermore, it was therein asserted that the Board of Directors, with the consent of the War Food Administrator, had entered into a contract with the firm of Ekern and Meyers, a Chicago concern, to assist the management in developing the program along sound insurance lines. What was paid this firm is not reported. But their employment seems to have ended. Why was it necessary to employ this firm at all? Why not appoint men skilled in insurance, instead of men who know nothing about the business? And above all, what good did these men do in furtherance of making crop insurance self-supporting? The record seems to disclose that the results brought about by these men to crop insurance amounted to very little, judging from results, and the Crop Insurance Corporation still continues to run at a loss.

In addition to the letters sent the departments, numerous interviews were had with those in authority but all ended in either an acknowledgment of failure in the past or a promise to make a better showing in the future.

Long and involved statements and reports were issued from time to time by the Department of Agriculture purporting to show some reason for the continuance of crop insurance by the Govern-

ment. However, a thorough examination of these reports invariably discloses that in the end the result was not only always disappointing but frequently unwarranted and indefensible, and a continuance of the project pointed to such loss to the Government which in a private corporation could only end in certain bankruptcy. But these losses that no private corporation can endure without disaster to both its usefulness and its stockholders, surely no Government can stand indefinitely. Sooner or later there must be an accounting and the longer such accounting is delayed the more serious it becomes and the more damage it does to the Government and the taxpayers who must support it.

Nevertheless, this letter of the War Food Administrator made promises and furnished a ray of hope to those of us who had seen the constant loss of the Crop Insurance Corporation. The Administrator's letter contained the following:

Experience has now been acquired which should prove invaluable in future operations, and we hope to profit by this experience even though much of it is not on the credit side of the ledger.

Again, we wanted to see what the "acquired experience" would bring about. One of the things brought about during that same year of 1945 was a worse deficit than had been suffered at any time before in the entire history of crop insurance. Another significant thing likewise brought about was the resignation of the War Food Administrator from his position as head of the agency or corporation for crop insurance and his appointment to another Government office or position.

Perhaps he saw the error in his prediction that "acquired experience" should prove invaluable in future operations, and abandoned crop insurance for a more congenial field of endeavor. In the meantime the American people, hoping for a balanced crop-insurance budget, must have felt the truth of the old proverb, "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick," as they saw the perpetually rising deficit.

The true financial condition of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation has been not only difficult but impossible to obtain. However at long last, on March 25, 1947, a belated audit report to Congress on the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation was placed on my desk for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, by the Comptroller General of the United States. Why was this report delayed by 1 year and approximately 9 months after June 30, 1945? Where is the report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946? What is actually the condition of this Corporation at present? These are pertinent questions and should be answered.

The confusion shown in this report is plainly evident. Beginning on page 4, I quote the following:

9. We are unable to give an opinion that the financial statements of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation fairly present its financial position at June 30, 1945, and its results of operations for the year ended that date for the following reasons:

(a) The financial statements do not include the results of operations for the 1945 crop year.

(b) The reserve for losses on collections for premiums for the 1943 and prior crop years may be inadequate.

However, the financial statements and comments in the report set forth these matters as completely as possible.

10. It is suggested that the Congress give consideration to the feasibility of continuance of the crop insurance program, and if it is determined that the program is to be continued, it is recommended that every possible step be taken to make the program financially successful. In this connection the following recommendations are submitted:

(a) The Corporation's management should be set up under a larger Board of Directors, serving on a part-time basis and including men of experience in insurance matters as well as the Secretary of Agriculture and representatives of agriculture and the general public. It should not be dominated by the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) The active management of the Corporation's affairs should be in executive officers selected by the Board. In addition to a man versed in farming, the top officers should include an individual with a broad insurance background, another who is an expert in insurance-sales promotion, and a controller serving as chief accounting officer. (See p. 7.)

(c) Every effort should be devoted toward development of sound underwriting policies and practices, insurance-sales promotion, and improved financial and accounting practices.

(d) Insurance contracts should be written in monetary terms rather than in commodity terms; this involves certain difficulties. (See p. 16.)

(e) The Corporation should have a fiscal year ending December 31, after the close of the crop season. (See p. 39.)

(f) Accounting for operating expenses should be simplified. (See p. 25.)

(g) The cotton plan should be reduced to a trial basis until sufficient reliable information has been gained to warrant the resumption of Nation-wide participation. (See p. 20.)

(h) We believe consideration should be given to allowing the management freedom by law to exclude areas from insurance on individual crops, when it finds there is little demand or economic need for such insurance in those areas. This would permit a substantial savings in operating expenses.

Subsequent to completion of this audit, but prior to release of this report, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson made public a letter to the chairman of the Agriculture Committees of both Houses of Congress in which he enclosed a letter directed to the Manager of the Corporation. The letter voiced views and criticisms of and suggestions by the Secretary, based on two studies which had been made for him by representatives of the National Association of Insurance Agents and the Hartford Fire Insurance Co. A subsequent press release pointed out the action already taken by the management to remedy some of the conditions to which attention was called and to withdraw certain of the criticisms. Many of our comments coincide with those contained in these reports which indicate a feeling within the Department of Agriculture of need for broad changes in the program.

From the foregoing it is seen that officers themselves do not know where they are going when they say "we are unable to give an opinion that the financial statements of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation fairly present its financial position." This is certainly a remarkable statement from a Corporation report. It reminds one of Dooley's grasshopper "that had a hell of a lot of action, but damn little direction."

In paragraph 10 we also find the following:

10. It is suggested that the Congress give consideration to the feasibility of continuance of the crop-insurance program, and if it is determined that the program is to be continued, it is recommended that every possible step be taken to make the program financially successful.

Of course it would take real courage to come out into the open and admit failure, but this statement comes as near to it as possible when it is acknowledged that if it is determined that the program is to be continued, it is recommended, and so forth. We suggest a reading of this recommendation.

The following quotation from page 7 of the report also shows that possibly my letters hereinbefore mentioned to this Corporation management, suggesting men of insurance experience to run it, may have been of some effect, for on page 7 of the report:

It is suggested that the importance of the crop-insurance program and the difficulties of establishing a sound program, if it be continued, require the policy-making direction of a Board of Directors composed of men experienced in insurance matters as well as representatives of agriculture and the general public. We recommend that, if the program is to be continued, the law should be amended to provide for a larger Board of Directors, serving on a part-time basis and including men of experience in insurance matters as well as the Secretary of Agriculture and representatives of agriculture and the general public; it should not be dominated by the Secretary of Agriculture. Active management of the Corporation's affairs should be in executive officers elected by the Board, including a president, one or more vice presidents, and a controller. One of the top officers should be a man with a broad insurance background, especially from an actuarial standpoint, because of the necessity of establishing sound underwriting policies and practices. Another, well versed in sales promotion, should be charged with improving sales technique and actively directing the sales organization. The controller, as the chief accounting officer, should have full responsibility and authority in directing all accounting activities in order to obtain better accounting and financial policies than now prevail.

However, it is to be noted that this report contains many remarkable statements suggestive of a desire to continue the Corporation even with its unsavory financial record, but at the same time admitting the probability of its discontinuance by Congress, such statements being: "If the program be continued we recommend," or "suggest," and so forth.

Page 17 of this report shows the costs of the program to 1945 to be as follows:

Insurance losses.....	\$38,126,200
Operating expenses.....	32,742,082
Total loss.....	70,868,282

Table does not include losses on 1945 crop program estimated to be \$13,641,550 but not recorded in accounts at June 30, 1945.

In addition to losses resulting from the excess of indemnities over premiums, the insurance loss figure reflects \$382,669 of unallocated costs, the largest portion of which was a provision of \$375,000 for losses on uncollectible premiums at June 30, 1945.

The act charges the Board of Directors with fixing premiums at rates sufficient to cover claims for indemnities and to establish a reasonable reserve against unforeseen losses. Premiums are not required to be sufficient

to cover any portion of the operating expenses (see p. 24). To date, not only has no reserve been accumulated, but capital has been consumed to the extent of \$38,126,200, exclusive of losses estimated for the 1945 fiscal year. Without exception, premiums failed to meet indemnities on all crops in each of the first 5 years as shown in terms of quantities in table IV.

The loss for 1945, which is above estimated to be \$13,641,550, but is not included in the above calculation, amounts really, according to letter of Secretary Anderson released February 26, 1947, to the astounding sum of \$17,536,218.74. And the end is not yet. If 1945 losses amount to \$17,536,218.74 this sum added to the losses before 1945 which are admitted to be \$70,863,282, the total through 1945 equals \$88,404,500.74. And what about losses of the year 1946, which are admitted to be very high?

When all the reports come in, may we not expect to find that even the entire sum of the capital stock of this corporation, that has already been issued amounting to \$70,000,000 and poured by the United States Government into this sinkhole, is entirely exhausted? We are surely warranted in assuming it to be gone in the light of the action of the Secretary of Agriculture who has held up all payments on cotton indemnities until Congress makes further appropriations.

This Corporation has, on its record, been "weighed and found wanting" and is still wanting, wanting, wanting—more money to keep its total of 945 employees on the public pay roll, notwithstanding its constant failures and losses in operation.

It has been reported, and I believe reliably so, that in many instances policies were taken by this Corporation on crops that were only planted and then abandoned by the farmer because it would pay him better to realize on his insurance than to cultivate and take care of his crops. Thus the chinch bug, the potato bug, the grasshopper, and the boll weevil had not only field days, but whole field seasons, under this crop-insurance plan, and increased, multiplied, and replenished their kind so tremendously until in some sections of the country they are destined to be difficult if not impossible to destroy.

In truth, crop insurance is tending to injure the farmer instead of benefiting him. Personally I have seen some fields of uncut grain long after the harvest season was past—fields that would yield, in my opinion, an average crop. Upon inquiry I learned that the grain was left standing in the field for the crows and other birds because it would cost considerable to harvest it and the farmer believed he could realize more from his crop insurance than would be possible if he harvested it. I am informed that this is a rather frequent occurrence in the cotton fields, and a potent factor in the great losses suffered there.

Since the losses in crop insurance have invariably been so heavy since its beginning, the time is at hand when it should be discontinued without delay. I hope this Congress that should be—and I believe it is—desiring to take this country out of the red, will no longer appropriate any money for the continuance

of crop insurance but repeal the act in its entirety. Let the insurance people who are qualified in business assume crop insurance, if it is to exist at all. Let us kill the bill. Let us help save America from bankruptcy.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, with further reference to the matter of crop insurance, I would like to say for the RECORD, in view of my conversation on the floor with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], that I approve the theory of crop insurance. I only regret that up to now it has not been possible for Congress and for the Corporation to devise a program that is workable from the standpoint of the country and from the standpoint of the producer, and I feel that the matter should be given further study by the Congress in the light of the experience which we have had.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read down to and including page 1, line 6.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2849) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEALL (at the request of Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made before the Committee on Un-American Activities by Mrs. Julia W. Talmadge, president-general of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEUGH] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a manuscript. He has been informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$195.25, but he asks that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, and notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SLOVAKIA

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, America and all liberty-loving nations should at this time concentrate against interna-

tional situations which might bring about war in the future. I have, on several occasions, stated on the floor of Congress that the application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter is our greatest antidote for future peace. Self-government, freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion is as essential for smaller countries as it is for the large nations. Our Nation, during World War II, spent billions of dollars and sacrificed in lives and casualties to preserve the above principles in order to insure liberty and future peace.

Since VJ-day, aggression and tyranny has again been launched in certain areas of Europe. The latest example of persecution, unfair trial, and threatened execution for political belief is that of Dr. Joseph Tiso, former President of the Interim Republic of Slovakia. Dr. Tiso has been acclaimed a hero in the eyes of nearly all the people of Slovakia and the prevailing majority of Americans of Slovak ancestry. My attention has been called to the fact that over 80 percent of the Slovak American fraternal organizations have forthrightly declared themselves to be of the opinion that Tiso was a hero in the defense of the best interests of the Slovak people. During his presidency, Slovakia thrived, progressed, and developed internally more than it had during any 5 years of the existence of the Czechoslovak Republic. The communistic control now over the country of Slovakia will execute Dr. Tiso, a political prisoner, unless our Government intervenes. This communistic control is inflicted upon the people of Slovakia in spite of the fact that the election of May 26, 1946, gave over 64 percent of the total vote cast against the present government. The press is likewise controlled, at least to the extent that the newspapers cannot publish what they think. This is evidenced in the fact that four American newspapers have been barred in Slovakia. The present communistic government will brook no freedom of political thought; though the people voted for Christian democracy, they received totalitarian communism.

The archbishop of Slovakia testified at the trial of Dr. Tiso. He is and has been a respected member not only of the hierarchy of Czechoslovakia, but of the official family of Czechoslovakia, including its President, Edward Benes. Appearing as a witness for Dr. Tiso, the archbishop testified that—

Tiso acted and worked in the interest of Slovakia and was never a traitor, and that his election as President of Slovakia was the will of 90 percent of the Slovaks at that time and was acclaimed by the bishops, priests, and ministers of both the Catholic and Protestant churches.

It is apparent that Czechoslovakia has been re-created with the aid of Moscow and that Moscow will undoubtedly demand the extinction of Slovak national leaders of ability and high intellect. The ways of the Communists are devious and it behooves us to understand more of the Slovakia situation. In the meantime, the least that freedom loving nations can ask is that the so-called peoples courts in the Communist-dominated countries in eastern Europe, refrain from

any further political executions or from liquidating political opposition by long-term imprisonment as in the case of Archbishop Stepanic. All of this adds up to the price we will have to pay to aid in the establishing of true democracy in the countries of eastern Europe to insure world peace.

In supporting President Truman's international program, we cannot be unmindful of what is happening throughout this region in Europe, comprising over 100,000,000 Christians who have nothing in common with communism. We have heard of political executions, imprisonment, and banishment of outstanding citizens in Poland, Lithuania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and other small countries. Thousands of brave Polish soldiers who fought to stamp out fascism are now prohibited from returning to their native Poland by a communistic controlled government. Americans are asking the question "do we not have at least a moral obligation to voice our protest against such trials and executions?"

The judge who presided at the trial of Dr. Tiso, previous to the trial, vowed personal vengeance on Tiso and was provided this opportunity by being placed in charge of the case.

These facts, though not appearing in the American press releases, are not disputed. Almost unanimously, the people of Slovak descent in America, are rising in protest to the impending execution of Dr. Tiso. I ask the Members of Congress to join with me in protesting this unjust conviction by interceding with President Truman and Secretary Marshall to use their good offices to prevent this injustice.

We might well apply the words of the Honorable Judge Robert H. Jackson:

All experience teaches that there are certain things you cannot do under the guise of judicial trial. * * * You must put no man on trial before anything that is called a court, if you are not prepared to establish his personal guilt. * * * If you are determined to execute a man in any case, there is no occasion for trial. The world yields no respect to courts that are merely organized to convict.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. GAMBLE), for an indefinite time, on account of illness.

To Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. O'TOOLE), for the week of March 31, 1947, on account of death in family.

To Mr. TOWE (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS), for 2 days, March 31 and April 1, on account of illness.

RESIGNATION FROM AND APPOINTMENT TO WASHINGTON-LINCOLN MEMORIAL-GETTYSBURG BOULEVARD COMMISSION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

MARCH 26, 1947.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Because of my other duties and committee assignments, I am forced to resign as a member of the Washington-Lincoln Memorial-Gettysburg Boule-

vard Commission. Please consider my resignation effective as of this date.

I do want to thank you for paying me the honor of having me appointed a member of the Commission and I regret that I am unable to serve.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 19, Seventy-fourth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the United States Commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial-Gettysburg Boulevard to fill the existing vacancy thereon the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

LOANS TO GREECE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, since 1824 when the new Greek Government, having fought a war of independence, obtained its first foreign loan from the London banks, that nation has been in financial bondage. The bankers of England and Europe discovered long ago that they had easy pickings in Greece. Year after year, they would extend large loans at top interest rates, and would take first mortgages on the revenue of the Greek Government. By 1843, the accumulated debts amounted to 66,000,000 drachmas. But that was just a beginning. There were the loans of 1879, for example, of 60,000,000 francs at 6 percent interest; there was the loan of 1881 of 120,000,000 francs at 5 percent interest; there was the loan of 1884 of 170,000,000 francs at 5 percent interest; there was the loan of 1887 of 135,000,000 francs at 4 percent interest.

It was natural that the London bankers should exact heavy service charges. Each new loan generally would provide for a certain amount of repayment on the old debt. Various requirements would be made for purchases abroad. All kinds of curious and interesting deductions were levied which made the net proceeds of these loans to the Greek Government comparatively small. The international London bankers did not let the Greek Government pay back the principal. They pushed the Greek Government further and further into debt, and constantly increased the service charges.

Indeed between 1879 and 1897, the Greeks paid a total of 470,000,000 francs for service and interest on their national debt, an amount corresponding roughly to the total amount borrowed, yet were unable to reduce the size of the total debt. On the contrary, their public debt rose from 1869 to 1893 from 137,000,000 to 823,000,000 drachmas.

But in 1897, Mr. Speaker, the bankers of London were just getting under way on bleeding Greece. There were two or three wars between 1890 and 1912 in the Balkans and the Near East in which Greece became involved. I would not suggest, of course, Mr. Speaker, that the bankers had anything to do with it. Subsequently, between 1912 and 1933, the

foreign indebtedness of Greece rose from 840,000,000 gold francs to 1,650,000,000 gold francs in 1933. Somebody, Mr. Speaker, was making money, but it was not the Greek people.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1897 the London bankers apparently wanted to make sure that they would get their interest, so they arranged an International Finance Commission to control Greek Government finances in order to safeguard the interest payments on the foreign indebtedness of the Greek Government. This commission, by agreement with the Greek Government, received the income from government monopolies in salt, kerosene, matches, cigarette paper, stamp taxes, and the custom duties of the Port of Piraeus. At various times in 1926, and again in 1929, and again in 1933, new revenues were pledged in order to be sure that the interest on the foreign indebtedness was paid. The Treaty of Geneva, for example, established in 1927, added new revenues in order to take care of new loans. The International Finance Commission obtained the revenue from the alcohol tax throughout Greece. The custom duties of six new cities were added to the revenue. In fact, Mr. Speaker, after 1927, the only unpledged public revenue left to the Greek Government were direct taxes, miscellaneous excise taxes, and export duties. Believe it or not, this commission still today continues to exist.

Mr. Speaker, does the International Finance Commission still have legal status? Is the greater portion of all revenue of the Greek Government still pledged for the payment of taxes on the Greek foreign indebtedness?

In round American dollars, the Greek Government owes apparently over five hundred million to the international bankers. The interest and principal of 90 percent of all of these loans are payable at the Hambro International Bank of London.

Mr. Speaker, the American people would like to know whether the loan proposed under the Truman Greek deal will go to pay off the bankers of London or whether it will go to assist the Greek people. Mr. Speaker, we should like to know whether or not the proposed loans to be made by us to the Greek Government will become a first mortgage on the revenue of the Greek Government or whether the international bank of London gets theirs first.

Mr. Speaker, from 1821 until today the international banks of London have received anywhere from four to five times the amount in interest, service charges, and other deductions—five times the amount they have actually lent the Greek Government during that period.

With the help of a corrupt monarchy, the international bankers have bled the Greek people and the Greek nation for five times what they have lent that country, and still today have by legal right the first lien, the first mortgage, on more than one-half of all the income of the Greek Government.

Mr. Speaker, the American people refuse to be suckers for a hundred-year-old scandal of international financial intrigue and blood-sucking.

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal of March 30, 1947]

TRUMAN'S "LOAN" PLAN GIVEN COLD APPRAISAL

For the benefit of those readers who came in late on our discussions of the \$400,000,000 Greco-Turkish loan, we submit the following dialog in which the editor is being questioned by a young man who has been reading the newspapers and finds himself, as nearly everyone else, slightly confused on the subject.

Question. What is the real purpose behind President Truman's proposal to lend Greece and Turkey \$400,000,000?

Answer. To stop the Russians.

Question. What are the Russians doing in Greece and Turkey?

Answer. Helping Greek and Turkish Communists to spread communistic propaganda and undermine the Governments.

Question. Are there any Russians in Greece and Turkey?

Answer. No.

Question. Then what are we worried about?

Answer. England has decided that she can no longer afford to finance King George's regime and has turned the job over to us.

Question. President Truman stated that 85 percent of the Greeks favor the present Government. If that is true, how can the other 15 percent overthrow the 85 percent who are supporting the King?

Answer. That's what we would like to know.

Question. When did England make this decision?

Answer. Secretary of State Byrnes was warned of the possibility last October but the British acted only 3 weeks ago.

Question. Why does Russia want to gobble up Greece and Turkey?

Answer. For centuries, the Russians have tried to get control of the Dardanelles. They were stopped by Britain and France in the Crimean War. After Russia whipped Turkey in 1877, Britain and other great powers deprived Russia of most of the fruits of victory in the treaty making.

Question. Why are Greece and Turkey so important to the British?

Answer. To protect British oil interests and the life-line through the Mediterranean, the Suez Canal and the road to India and other British Far East possessions.

Question. Will the proposed \$400,000,000 loan keep the Russians out of Greece?

Answer. Not if they use force.

Question. Have there been any indications that Russia intends to invade Greece and Turkey?

Answer. No. So far, the Russians have been content to wage a propaganda war of nerves.

Question. Why can't the United Nations handle a situation of this sort?

Answer. The UN conceivably could succeed as it did in Iran where the Russians gave up their attempts to establish a government friendly to the USSR when the force of public opinion became too strong.

Question. Why didn't we try to solve this situation through the United Nations?

Answer. You will have to get the answer to that one from President Truman.

Question. Wasn't the UN established to stop potential aggressors?

Answer. Yes, but Representative GEORGE SMATHERS of Florida says it hasn't had time to catch up with world problems.

Question. Is this a good argument?

Answer. Not in my opinion.

Question. What about Turkey?

Answer. Turkey was Germany's ally in World War I and aided the Axis powers in World War II while posing as a neutral.

Question. Do you personally know this to be true?

Answer. Yes.

Question. If we are trying to stop the spread of communism in Greece with dollars, what about other nations facing similar situations?

Answer. They will all have communism for sale at a price.

Question. Will we loan them money, too?

Answer. Yes, if the President and his advisers are sincere in their crusade against communism.

Question. Do you have any doubts about that?

A. I don't like to question men's motives but there are certain political advantages these days in fighting communism. You may have noticed that the President is now determined to purge his administration of known communists. Some of us urged the same course of action years ago when Communists within the Government were being accepted in the best Washington circles as liberals.

Question. Is the Russian threat similar to Hitler's march in the Rhineland?

Answer. No. In Hitler's case, England and France winked cynically at the violation of the Versailles treaty because Great Britain's traditional policy of power politics always made her cuddle up to the second strongest power in Europe.

Question. What do you think of William Bullitt's recommendation that the United States should not "hesitate to use the atomic bomb to stop new crimes of Soviet imperialism?"

Answer. Bullitt is a volatile, unstable ass who failed in every ambassadorial post and thought he could persuade the Russians to like us by teaching them to play polo.

Question. Did Franklin D. Roosevelt get along with the Russians?

Answer. Very well indeed, by giving them nine-tenths of the Balkans, the Kuriles, Dalren, Port Arthur and half of the 20 billions in reparations from Germany and everything else that wasn't nailed down.

Question. I see the Turks don't want any strings attached to the United States loan.

Answer. That's right. When you offer to lend a fellow money, he sometimes gets arrogant about it.

Question. Why did Governor Dewey give the Greco-Turkish loan his support?

Answer. Hadn't you noticed? Mr. Dewey is running for president. His statement fitted in nicely with designation of March 25 as "Greek War Relief day."

Question. Aren't you in favor of helping the Greeks?

Answer. Absolutely. The resources of the International bank (formed for that purpose) could help stabilize the Greek economy. Greek credits frozen in London should also be used. A private charity drive for Greek relief would be enthusiastically supported in the United States. Actually, we have already given the Greeks \$358,000,000 in food, clothing, medical and other supplies.

Question. Why then, don't you favor a Government loan and so forth as it has been called?

Answer. Because it is an open invitation to war.

Question. What do you mean by that?

Answer. Approval of the loan by Congress will mean that we have sidetracked the United Nations to take over Great Britain's traditional role as world policeman. It will mean that we are shaking our fist in Russia's face and warning her not to try any more of "that funny stuff."

It will mean that we are pledged to fight communism wherever it may exist and at whatever cost. It will mean that we are discarding world democracy for visions of empire.

It will mean that all of the high and lofty principles enunciated in the Charter of the United Nations have been scrapped.

It is a road that can lead only to war.

Question. But Acting Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Secretary of War Patterson say they see slight possibility of war, and

that "the sending of combat troops is not contemplated."

Answer. That "not contemplated" phrase, my boy, is better known as diplomatic double talk.

Question. What would you do about the spread of communism?

Answer. Communism is an ideology that cannot be stopped by sticking a \$400,000,000 thorn into Russia's side. To quote an unknown author, "Communism will be stopped by something that works better."

No lasting support will accrue to communism unless it is believed to yield benefits which the capitalistic system cannot provide.

Let us demonstrate, as expressed by Allen Haden, formerly of the Chicago Daily News foreign service, "that our system is a living, breathing, satisfying system within which men and women live better and more freely than in any other."

Question. What did you think of Fiorello LaGuardia's remark that "conditions in the Balkans can't be corrected overnight or in 10 years—it will take a generation"? Also, his statement that we will rue the day we ever entered the Balkans alone?

Answer. I agree. But the military is already girding its loins for war.

The pronouncement by Admiral Chester Nimitz that "the Army and Navy are prepared for operations that might have to be carried on in the event of another national emergency" is ominously prophetic.

When top-drawer admirals of Nimitz's caliber start talking about "operations," they don't mean target practice.

Question. You sound mighty pessimistic, Mr. Editor.

Maybe I'd better start thinking about what branch of service I'd like.

Answer. That's no joke, son.

How about a nice, safe job in the State Department?

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an editorial.)

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to provide for the printing and distribution of certain matter relating to congressional activities, authorized by section 221 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 931. An act to extend certain powers of the President under title 111 of the Second War Powers Act.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did, on March 28, 1947, present to the President, for his approval,

a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1240. An act to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. J. Res. 76. A joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard; and

H. J. Res. 159. A joint resolution making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 1, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

504. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497; 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Public Lands.

505. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a detailed report showing credit operations through June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

506. A letter from the Associate Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Cecil T. May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

507. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

508. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed amendment to the organic act of 1944 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the authorities of the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, as well as the several States, in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

509. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of its activities and expenditures for the month of November 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

510. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the heads of executive departments and independent establishments of the United States Government to grant employees leaves of absence for research and study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

511. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

512. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the selection for elimination

and retirement of officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services, H. R. 1375. A bill to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve; without amendment (Rept. No. 203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CARSON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, H. R. 2331. A bill to amend section 20A of the Interstate Commerce Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLSWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, H. R. 2336. A bill to amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to permit, subject to certain conditions, the use of Coast Guard radio stations for the reception and transmission of commercial messages; without amendment (Rept. No. 205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HESELTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, H. R. 2758. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIRKSEN: Committee on the District of Columbia, H. R. 2568. A bill authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOLLIVER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, H. R. 2759. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicles, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders; with amendments (Rept. No. 208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2856. A bill to provide transportation of passengers on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 2857. A bill to extend second-class mailing privileges to bulletins issued by State conservation and fish and game agencies or departments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 2858. A bill to provide a permanent civil-service status to certain Federal employees and reinstatement rights to former employees who have been discharged from

the service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

E. R. 2859. A bill to regulate the sale of essays or proofs of postage stamps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 2860. A bill to provide protection for designs for textile fabrics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2861. A bill to protect the public health, safety, and interest from the cessation, as a result of certain labor disputes, of interstate or foreign commerce in essential public services; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2862. A bill to protect the public health, safety, and interest from the cessation, as a result of certain labor disputes, of interstate or foreign commerce in essential public services injuriously affecting the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2863. A bill to provide for the protection of the Dall sheep, caribou, and other wildlife native to the Mount McKinley National Park area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RICH:

H. R. 2864. A bill to provide that the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation shall not enter into insurance contracts to insure producers of agricultural commodities against any loss in yields; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2865. A bill to provide a sea wall or other form of shore protection at the town of Nome, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2866. A bill to extend percentage depletion at the 15-percent rate to bentonite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2867. A bill to permit, subject to certain conditions, mining locations under the mining laws of the United States within that portion of the Harney National Forest designated as a game sanctuary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2868. A bill to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 2869. A bill to provide that the beneficiaries of certain Government employees who died between December 6, 1941, and December 21, 1944, shall be compensated for leave accumulated and accrued by such employees but not taken; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2870. A bill to amend the act approved February 25, 1946, permitting the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, without administration of estates; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2871. A bill to amend section 302 (a) of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 2872. A bill to amend further section 4 of the Public Debt Act of 1941, as amended, and clarify its application, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROCKWELL:

H. R. 2873. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2874. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. R. 2875. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator through the Commissioner of Public Buildings to operate the building known as the Capitol Park Hotel as a dwelling for Members of Congress and their employees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2876. A bill to create the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Redwood Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2877. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 2878. A bill to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the census roll of the Indians of California provided for therein; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 2879. A bill to authorize the unconditional grant of all interest of the United States in certain school buildings and temporary housing to educational institutions without consideration; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite foreign countries to participate in the St. Louis World's Fair 1953, Inc., in the city of St. Louis, during the year 1953; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. Res. 165. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the administration of the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, and related matters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. Res. 166. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Agriculture to undertake an investigation with respect to the potato surplus; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the Secretaries of War and of the Navy and of the Interior to make a resurvey of the needs of the armed forces in Hawaii with the view to returning to the Territorial government all public lands, especially park and beach areas, and to private owners all private lands now under process of condemnation proceedings, where such lands are not immediately needed for military or naval purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging and recommending that legislation be enacted to provide for two United States district judges, instead of only one, for the third judicial division, Territory of Alaska, and that said additional district judge be located at Valdez, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass such legislation as will result in providing for prisoners interned in foreign countries a status similar to that provided for prisoners of war interned in the possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting that road funds allotted the Public Roads Administration for new construc-

tion in Alaska be materially increased; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to endorsement of H. R. 1770; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting that an extension of the road in Chugach National Forest for a distance of approximately 9.6 miles to Point White-shed be authorized and that funds therefor be specifically allocated from public roads and National Forest Service funds for such work in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to abolish regulation W; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing the completion of the San Diego aqueduct with Government funds; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 2880. A bill for the relief of Miklos Weiss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2881. A bill for the relief of Henry Atmik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKNEY:

H. R. 2882. A bill for the relief of Alexander George Kalesky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2883. A bill for the relief of Louis Angelefsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

H. R. 2884. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Hancock, administratrix of the estate of Arch F. Hancock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWARD:

H. R. 2885. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Becker Little Light; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2886. A bill authorizing the sale under supervision of land of Richard Little Light; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2887. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Bernard Old Coyote, Sr.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2888. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Sternshein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 2889. A bill for the relief of Aubrey F. Houston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 2890. A bill for the relief of Rudolph Gaspare Vassura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 2891. A bill for the relief of Mattie A. Horner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. R. 2892. A bill for the relief of Henrique David Fernandes Garim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2893. A bill for the relief of Chester Chuji Fujino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 2894. A bill for the relief of Domenico Salvi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2895. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Terwilliger and Alberta M. Terwilliger Palmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2896. A bill for the relief of the Great American Indemnity Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 2897. A bill for the relief of the Marden Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2898. A bill for the relief of Doris Marie Richard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 2899. A bill authorizing the appointment and retirement of John Tomlinson as a second lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

286. By Mr. JONES of Alabama: Petition to the Congress from the distributors of TVA power; to the Committee on Public Works.

287. By Mr. NORBLAD: House Joint Memorial No. 15 of the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass such legislation as will result in providing for prisoners interned in foreign countries a status similar to that provided for prisoners of war interned in the possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

288. By Mr. PRICE of Illinois: Petition transmitted by Mr. R. C. Carpenter in behalf of Local Union No. 129, Progressive Mine Workers of America, at Frankfort Heights, Ill., petitioning Congress to make revision upward in the benefits of social-security annuitants and for the reduction in the age requirement from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

289. Also, petition transmitted by Mr. Robert Harriman in behalf of Local Union No. 73; Progressive Mine Workers of America, at Marissa, Ill., petitioning Congress to make revision upward in the benefits of social-security annuitants and for the reduction in the age requirement from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

290. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Resolution of the officers and executive committee of the Maine State Bar Association, by Herbert E. Locke, secretary and treasurer, Augusta, Maine, expressing their approval and endorsement of the bill to amend the Employers' Liability Act, H. R. 1639; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

291. Also, resolution of Assembly No. 3, Slovak Catholic Sokol, Lisbon Falls, Maine, Helen Tenco, president, and Mary Adams, secretary, urging congressional investigation of the Czechoslovak question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

292. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 6355, adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge that the full amount necessary to the usual efficient conduct of the Customs Bureau be provided in the Federal budget to insure that the operations of that important agency of government shall not be curtailed or rendered ineffective; to the Committee on Appropriations.

293. By the SPEAKER: Petition of E. Trecklas and other Lithuanian displaced persons, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to making efforts to change immigration laws, permitting all Lithuanian refugees in western Europe to enter the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

294. Also, petition of Robert L. Reynolds, Madison, Wis., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to a proposal to

deal with strike situations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

295. Also, petition of the Friendship Townsend Club, No. 1, of Miami, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

296. Also, petition of John Riner, president, group 9, SS. Cyril and Methodius of the Slovak Catholic Sokol, Johnstown, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for a full congressional investigation of the whole Czechoslovak question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

When we are honestly perplexed and have to do something, and are not sure what to do, we need Thy help, O God. In our choices let us not ask, "Will it work?" but, rather, "Is it right?" In this prayer we reach up to Thee. May we find that Thou art reaching down to us, and may we believe that when we are willing to listen Thou wilt speak. We wait upon Thee, O God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Monday, March 31, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, April 1, 1947, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 931) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1621) to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the world jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947, and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Prior to the call of the roll, may the Chair say that the Foreign Relations Committee presents the request that it be permitted to sit the remainder of the day. Without objection, that order will be made. The Chair hears no objection.

(At this point Mr. BARKLEY yielded to Mr. WILEY, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. MYERS, respectively, each of whom, as in legislative session, presented matters of routine business, which appear elsewhere in today's RECORD under the appropriate headings.)

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I renew my point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Connor
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Hoey	Overton
Bricker	Joland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kilgore	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cain	Langer	Smith
Capper	Lodge	Sparkman
Chavez	Lucas	Stewart
Connally	McCarran	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eaton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Col. Samuel N.

Karrick, Corps of Engineers, for appointment as a member of the California Debris Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nomination of Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey to be Director of the Office of Selective Service Records. It is a unanimous report of that committee. It may be necessary later in the day to ask unanimous consent that the nomination be taken up for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

TRANSACTION OF LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following routine business was transacted:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 27)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency amounting to \$20,000, fiscal year 1947, in the form of an amendment as contained in House Document No. 101, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Secretaries of War and of the Navy and of the Interior to make a resurvey of the needs of the armed forces in Hawaii with the view to returning to the Territorial government all public lands, especially park and beach areas, and to private owners all private lands now under process of condemnation proceedings, where such lands are not immediately needed for military or naval purposes

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-fourth Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretaries of War and of the Navy and of the Interior of the United States of America, be, and they are hereby, requested to make a resurvey of the needs of the armed forces in Hawaii with a view to returning to the territorial government all public lands, particularly beach areas and areas suitable for public parks, and to private owners all private lands now under process of condemnation proceedings, where such lands are not immediately needed for military or naval purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretaries of War and of the Navy and of the Interior, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America."